

# BACONIANA

VOL. XXXI.

No. 122.

January 1947

## EDITORIAL NOTES

"SHAKESPEARE'S WILL." When the literary department of The Principal Probate Registry at Somerset House was reopened to the public on September 16th, after six years, a "feature" was made of what is called "Shakespeare's will." The *Evening Standard* of that date said this was "considered the most valuable of the priceless collection."

Discerning students have long suspected that there has been considerable tampering with the will, especially with regard to the uninitialled and unsigned interlineations as to "the second-best bed" (the fact that Shakspeare had a wife was an afterthought!) and the bequests to Heminge and Condell (inserted to make it appear as the will of a player who did not forget his old pals). Both these interlineations were written in a different hand and colour of ink to the body of the will.

Mr. Archibald Stalker in *The Quarterly Review*, April, 1940, wrote a powerful and unanswered argument for the will being a complete forgery.

\* \* \*

SHAKESPEARE AND ITALIAN. In *John O' London's Weekly*, of 20th September, a correspondent (S. G. Thomas, of the Rectory, Michel Troy, Monmouth) wrote proving Shakespeare's familiarity with the Italian language and literature. As he pointed out, it was well known that Shakespeare borrowed the plots for *Othello*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Cymbeline* and *Much Ado*, from Cinthio, Fiorentino, Boccaccio and Bandello respectively, and none was available in translation. Nor was the Italian comedy *Gl'Inganni*, on which *Twelfth Night* is based. Some of the evidence stated in this letter was new to us. For instance:

"Shakespeare made use of Italian words and expressions, and even idiom is occasionally reproduced as, for example, in the phrase 'combinatè husband' (*Measure for Measure*, III, 3). In the same play there is a striking parallel between Shakespeare's 'top of judgment' and Dante's 'cima di giudizio' (*Purgatorio*, VI, 37), while the phrase 'the ape of nature' (*Winter's Tale*, V, 2) is also a literal translation of 'scimia di natura' (*Inferno*, XXIX,

139). If these are not coincidences, they afford another strong link in the chain of evidence.

Many Italian writers have vouched for Shakespeare's familiarity with the geography, customs, laws and language, and the literature of their country.

\* \* \*

LEARNING IN SHAKESPEARE'S TIME. Misjudging Shakespeare's period by the literature bequeathed by its self-effacing intellectuals, modern commentators tell us that England was saturated in a flood of culture. Documentary evidence, and the observations of men who were then living prove that the reverse was the truth. Goadby, in *The England of Shakespeare*, quoting a contemporary observes, "It was thought enough for a nobleman's son to wind his horn, carry his hawk fair, and leave study and learning to meaner people."

The following passage in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (1634) reveals the accepted qualifications of a gentleman of those times:

<i>Theseus</i>	Your father, Sure, is a happy sire, then. What proves you?
<i>Arcite</i>	A little of <i>all</i> noble qualities. I could have kept a hawk, and well have holla'd To a deep cry of dogs; I dare not praise My feat of horsemanship, yet they that know me Would say it was my best piece; last and greatest I would be thought a soldier.
<i>Theseus</i>	You are perfect.

Learning is conspicuous by its absence.

\* \* \*

"SHAKESPEARE AND LIFE." This was the title of a lecture by Mr. Rennie Barker at the Folk House, Bristol, and it was one of a university sessional course. From the report in *The Western Daily Press* of 26th September, we are glad to note the admission that "students of Shakespeare's works are faced with a problem at the outset, for the works teem with learning showing the author to have extensive knowledge of history, law, medicine, politics, theology astronomy, and the thought of the times." He might have added Latin, Greek, French, Italian, music, travel, seamanship, court etiquette, etc., and not only "the thought of the times," but of generations then unborn. So far, Mr. Barker might have been arguing for the unorthodox. He realises this, and tries to explain his difficulties away with typically fatuous and false statements such as "They (the works) were written by the son of a merchant educated at a small grammar school."

To describe a village butcher or glover as a "merchant" is sheer and scarcely honest euphemism. What a lucky chance there was this small school at Stratford to which his "biographers" could send



him! Some of them now admit that it was too small to contain him, and he has been consigned to some house of the nobility.

Mr. Barker performs another somersault and he comes to earth with telling his students that the writer of the plays "was not learned in an academic way." All this knowledge was "gleaned from accidental intelligence!"

Mr. Barker should be rebuked by the authorities.

\* \* \*

SHAKESPEARE AND CATULLUS. In *The Tempest* (IV, i) Prospero says to Ferdinand:

If I have too austere punished you,  
Your compensation makes amends; for I  
Have given you here a *third* of mine life,  
Or that for which I live.

Most editions since the 18th century have followed Lewis Theobald's emendation of the Folio and read "thread" instead of "third."

It is, on the face of it, not easy to understand why Miranda should be a third of her father's life, but she is an only child, and as that "piece of virtue"—her mother—completed the family there seems nothing wrong with the Folio reading. It would have been most ungenerous of Prospero to have told Miranda she was "a thread!" In *The Taming of the Shrew* (IV, 3) it is used as an insult:

"Thou liest, thou thread . . . . . Braved in my  
own house with a skein of thread?"

We must turn to Catullus (LXII) for the explanation of what Prospero meant:

"Virginitas non tota tua est; ex parte parentum est; *Tertia pars* patri est; pars est data *tertia* matri. *Tertia* sola tua est.

(Your maidenhood is not all your own; partly it belongs to your parents; a third part belongs to your father; a third to your mother, and only a third is yours).

The writings of Catullus were not translated into English until 1795. We are probably right to accept the Folio rendering.

\* \* \*

CONCEALED AUTHORSHIP. Poets and other writers of Shakespeare's time are frequently found alluding to the practice of publishing under other names. The writer recently came across one from a rare work which he has never seen quoted. It occurs in *Lingua, or the Combat of the Tongue and the five Senses for Superiority*. This anonymous allegorical play was printed by Eld in 1607. The passage reads:

"I helped Herodotus to pen some part of his muses; lent Pliny inke to write his history; rounded Rabelais in the eare when he historied Pantagruell. As for Lucian, I was his genius.

O, those two Bookes *De Vera Historia*! Howsoever they go under his name, I'll be sworne I writ them."

Of course, this is not to be taken literally or seriously, but it shows what was in the author's mind. He knew that names were not to be relied upon as to authorship.

\* \* \*

SHAKESPEARE'S "INDUSTRY." In *Ego*, 7 (p. 309), James Agate computes that from September, 1921 to December, 1939, he wrote at least five million words. Shakespeare's works are about one fifth of that total, and he is supposed to have written them between 1589 and 1612 (23 years). If he had averaged between 12 and 13 lines per day it would have been sufficient. The works known as "Shakespeare's" would have made very little demand upon the author's time, and the natural inference is that they represent but a fraction of his real output. Where are his prose works? Where is his correspondence? We shall not find either under the name of "Shakespeare."

\* \* \*

SHAKESPEARE AS COUNTRYMAN. The reviewers of H. G. Massingham's *Where Man Belongs* (Collins), have mainly fixed their attention on an erroneous and misleading section in which the author seeks to show that Shakespeare wrote essentially as a countryman. Mr. Massingham has deluded himself and his reviewers. Few poets have written more inaccurately of the countryside and natural history. Shakespeare relied more upon the curious legends and superstitions found in the Bible, Pliny, Ovid, Virgil and other books rather than personal observation. But he has only to mention a bird, beast, tree or flower, forest, field or hedge, to produce a farrago of nonsense about wanderings by the banks of Avon, as if nature existed nowhere else, or one had to travel at least 20 miles from London to reach the country as one now does.

It is generally overlooked that London's population was then not more than 200,000, and most of it was packed within the City walls. Bermondsey and Islington were rural, and Oxford Street was bordered by hedges and meadows. We might ask Mr. Massingham why Shakespeare should have transferred the Forest of Ardenne from Lodge's *Rosalynde*, if he had been born and bred in the country.

\* \* \*

SHAKESPEARE AND POSTERITY. Writing in *The Newcastle Journal* of 12th October, Mr. Lynn Fenton tells his readers that Shakespeare did not write for posterity "but for an age." We are "informed" that "he wanted his plays to be patronised by a large theatre-going public!" How does Mr. Fenton reconcile this with the immense length of such masterpieces as *Hamlet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* when the duration of the public performances was "two short hours?" And why did he parade that mass of classical, legal and other specialized learning for audiences which were, for the most



part, totally illiterate? Shakespeare himself gives the lie to Mr. Fenton, who might turn to Sonnets 18, 19, 55, etc. We are glad to observe that one enlightened Newcastle reader, who signs himself "Pallas Athena" pointed out that the purpose of the plays was not money-making but "education, and the moral uplift of mankind."

\* \* \*

**COLLECTIVE RESEARCH.** It occurs to the writer that Baconians engaged on difficult research, or investigations which are liable to result in controversy should, before publication, exchange reports either in conference, or by correspondence with a few appointed experts. This would be somewhat on the methods of Scotland Yard which gets clues of wide divergence from all sorts of places. Not all are worth following up. Many are false scents and cases of mistaken identity, but good and bad are considered and sifted, finally leaving the reliable ones. Thus search is narrowed down, and concentration fixed on what is reliable. If we adopted such a method, we should save the space and expense of articles which would fail to stand up to a searching examination. After all, it is only human to get carried away by enthusiasm and, due to an excess of zeal to overlook possible objections to our theories. This idea of aiming at collective rather than individual views need only be considered in the light of challenging or disputatious theories. Ciphers for example sometimes prove a bone of contention even among those who are cipherists, but it must be borne in mind that because an individual may be skilled in decipherment, when it comes to a cipher such as the Biliteral it needs prolonged familiarity in varying forms of type.

\* \* \*

**ANOTHER "POST MORTEM."** How many times, especially in the past forty years, we have been told that "the Baconian theory is dead!" In *The Nineteenth Century and After* (November, 1946), Mr. R. C. Churchill finds that the "corpse" which refuses to lie down has at last been "liquidated" by our late President, Dr. Melsome! The reason given is this extract from *The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy* ((pp. 63-64):

"We now come to the seventh reminder of Bacon:—

"New-conceived,

*And so in progress to be hatch'd and born.* "Born", applies to animals and "hatch'd" to birds; and between the conception and the hatching of the egg some time must elapse; and this is what interested Bacon, who says, '*for birds there is double inquiry: the distance between the treading and the laying of the egg; and again between the egg laid, and the DISCLOSING or HATCHING* (Sylva Sylvarum, 759).

While Hamlet's 'melancholy sat on brood' his uncle said,  
                                   'There's something in his soul,  
 O'er which his melancholy sits on brood;  
 And I do doubt the HATCH and the DISCLOSE  
 Will be some danger.' (V. i, 309).

His objections to this parallelism are twofold:

1. The styles of Bacon and Shakespeare are different.
2. Bacon says "disclosing *or* hatching," while Shakespeare writes "the hatch *and* the disclose."

He appears to deduce from this that Shakespeare did not know that "hatch" and "disclose" mean the same thing, whereas Bacon does. As Shakespeare uses "disclosed" later in the play (V. i) for birds newly hatched, it is evident that he knew the word as a synonym. The use of "disclose" in the first Hamlet passage is most subtle because it has *two* very apt meanings, and both are applicable.<sup>1</sup> It is the "disclosure" of what is *brooding* in Hamlet's soul which Claudius fears, for the guilty king knows the cause of Hamlet's melancholy.

Mr. Churchill admits that he is not familiar with Bacon's acknowledged works. He does not appear to read Shakespeare with much intelligence. He has even put into Dr. Melsome's book something which is not there, and was never claimed by the author. Readers of *The Nineteenth Century* are told that "the argument is conducted through a comparison of thoughts and styles of the two writers." Note the introduction of "styles!" It is a cunning example of orthodox dishonesty intended to mislead. Nowhere did Dr. Melsome claim identity of style. He was concerned, as his Preface and his Book prove, with "the unity of the Bacon-Shakespeare *mind*." It is true that he found "many identities of thought and diction," but "diction" does not mean *style*. Dr. Melsome was an intelligent and sensible man, and he knew that blank verse drama could not be written in the same style as essays, philosophical writings, letters and speeches. Shakespeare does not make Henry V argue with Williams (IV, i) in the language of his address to his soldiers before Harfleur (III, i). If these two speeches were the sole survivors of a lost play nobody would imagine for one moment that the same man had written both, though both are masterpieces of their widely different kinds. We should look for the author of that speech beginning "So if a son that is by his father sent about merchandise" among the lawyers of the time and, by virtue of its felicity of phrasing and the skill of its pleading, it would not be long before the name of Bacon was advanced. Does Mr. Churchill consider that Coleridge could not have written "Aids to Reflection" because it bears no possible relation to "The Ancient Mariner?"

<sup>1</sup>Had Shakespeare written "*or* the disclose," the double meaning would not have been clear. It was put purposely, though in vain, for Mr. Churchill and his like.



It was our intention to reply fully to this article and send it to the Editor of *The Nineteenth Century*, but after reading it through twice looking for points made either for Strafford or against Bacon as Shakespeare, we find no such argument. It is like Falstaff's supper "but one halfpenny-worth of bread to an intolerable deal of sack!" Even the sack is watered down to cheap sneers at The Bacon Society and Baconians in general.

*Ex nihilo nihil fit.* But we accept the free advertisement of The Bacon Society and of Dr. Melsome's book.

\* \* \*

DR. J. QUINCY ADAMS. We regret to note the death on 11th November, at the age of 65, of Dr. J. Quincy Adams, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Memorial Library, Washington. He was never able to bequeath to the world the full benefit of his learning because it was "cabined, cribbed and confined" by the narrow limits of Shakespearean orthodoxy. In May, 1943, he stole the headlines with the announcement of the discovery at the Folger Library of a seventh "signature" of Shakspeare on a copy of Lambarde's *Archaeionomia* (1568) which, by a strange coincidence, had once belonged to the present writer but, being lent, was never returned. This "signature" was discovered on ironing out the warped vellum binding. Inside the front of the cover somebody had written "Mr. Wm. Shakspeare lived at No. 1, Little Crown Street, Westminster, N.B. near Dorset Steps." This Mr. Adams claimed as having been written by the player, whereas it is obviously in a late 18th or early 19th century hand and ink. As the numbering of houses did not come about until nearly 150 years after Shakspeare's death, either somebody was playing a practical joke with both the "signature" and the address, or both were clumsy forgeries. It might, of course, have been some William Shakspeare of a later date who owned the book. The whole story, with a reproduction of the "signature" appeared in *Baconiana*, October, 1943.

\* \* \*

OURSELVES. The Bacon Society is steadily enrolling more members, but we should like to multiply their numbers a thousand-fold and perhaps it may not be too optimistic to believe that ere long there is reason to forecast great developments. It might be mentioned here that no-one concerned or connected with the Society receives the slightest emolument, and all gladly give their services, including the Editors, *in honoris causa*, gratis, their sole object being to render justice and to reinstate in his true position the memory of the great English genius and patriot. We do claim among other aims to be reconstructing the true course of history in the Elizabethan and early Jacobean period.

\* \* \*

We possess members in many lands, and the farther distant they are often the more enthusiastic they appear to be. While speaking of our overseas membership we much regret to report the death in

November last of Miss Norah Sampson, M.A., of Wanganui, New Zealand. Member of a family noted for scholarship, she had a distinguished career as an educationalist, and was an unswerving Baconian. Only a short time before her passing away she wrote to a friend, saying, "I feel justice should be done to Bacon; I felt it strongly when I went to St. Albans. I visited Stratford in 1938 and am sure the refusal to have the grave opened is not just because of the curse on the tombstone. From my early twenties I have always thought that the rustic of Stratford could not be the author of those great speeches. A person at Stratford asked me why Baconians wanted to upset old beliefs, and that it did not matter who wrote the plays, for we have them and that is enough. "But," said Miss Sampson, "I want to see justice done." She might have retorted to the Stratfordian that the one thing their town is trading on is the personality of the sham Shakespeare, and the last wish of theirs is to accept the plays without "our Will."

\* \* \*

THE JUMPING FLEA. Among our enthusiastic oversea readers we must not overlook that most active Californian member, Earle Cornwall, of Los Angeles, whose outspoken and amusing views frequently embellish our correspondence columns. Mr. Cornwall has a grievance. He has a New England friend who, despite all Mr. Cornwall's efforts, treats the Bacon claim with utter contumely. He encloses an extract from a letter from his "buddy" and in colourful phrases invites us to "tame this animal." The writer of the letter, he informs us, is a literary man though not a professional, "a great reader, a man nearing sixty, one of the sort we occasionally meet who seem to take personal affront when the controversy is mentioned." We know the type over here only too well.

\* \* \*

"I don't care" writes this worthy, "who will finally be accepted as the author of Shakespeare's Plays, but when the proper authorities announce their decision, I shall be willing to accept it." What sort of "authority" does the New Englander mean? The only authorities are scholars and students of the Plays and Sonnets and the greatest men in the realms of literature, science, judicature, and philosophy have come down solid for Bacon. The evidence for Bacon weighs down heavily in the scale, but this New Englander does not apparently want evidence. "What I have read on the sinister side of the controversy has not prejudiced me in favour of the Baconians." He asserts: "Take Delia Bacon, she was one of the first to advance the notion that the plays were written by a group headed by Bacon and including Raleigh and Spenser, and that 'a great system of thought was concealed in them by ciphers.'" His attack on her is not only sublimely ignorant but apart from being a very learned Shakespearean and Elizabethan scholar, she was right about the existence of ciphers. BACONIANA is constantly showing ciphers in the Plays and of course there were such compatriots of the New Englander as Dr. Orville W.



Owen and Mrs. Elizabeth Gallup, whose history derived from Bacon's ciphers have been known for half a century. His facts are wrong again when he speaks of the "flop" of Mark Twain's book on Bacon-Shakespeare. "The book would shake the word" said Mark, according to this New Englander, "but what a flop! Mark Twain himself could not quite figure out what the author was talking about!" In A. B. Paine's well-known *Life of Mark Twain*, although Paine was a Stratfordian, he says, "Mark Twain's own book on the subject, *Is Shakespeare Dead?* found a wide acceptance and probably convinced many readers." So what? There are many unhappy people whose entire outlook is cramped by a wall of prejudice. Our New Englander is one of that type. He will never see through it, and his only chance to escape the dreary vista of pedantry is to transform himself into a jumping flea and boldly face what lies beyond.

\* \* \*

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Sir,

#### BACON'S COAT-OF-ARMS

In BACONIANA (July p. 116) Mr. Biddulph reproduced the illustration from *The Mirrour for Majestie* (1618) which was intended to depict Lord Chancellor Bacon's coat-of-arms. It shows the shield blank except for the "chief," which contains two mullets pierced, differenced by a crescent as denoting the younger line.

He is curious as to the reason for this omission when all the other "coats" of the various celebrities in the book are complete.

May not the reason be that early in 1618, Bacon was made Lord Chancellor? In the book he is given this title. Later (on 12th July of that year) he was further raised to the peerage and took the title of Baron Verulam. The natural inference is that the author of *The Mirrour for Majestie* could not ascertain, in time for publication, exactly what arms the new Baron would bear.

Yours faithfully,

PROSPERO.

## THE STRANGE RAINBOW PORTRAIT OF QUEEN ELIZABETH

By A. METAPHOR.

**T**HIS beautiful painting of Queen Elizabeth hangs in the private apartments at Hatfield, the Elizabethan mansion of the Cecil family, and is said to have been painted by Zuccherò who came to England in 1574. Previously he worked at the Vatican but quarelled with some of the Pope's officials, and he then spent four years in England and painted, amongst others, the Earl of Leicester about the time of the Kenilworth Festivities in July 1575. This portrait is now in the possession of the Earl of Effingham. The Rainbow portrait is certainly an allegorical picture, one it would seem of a series which Bacon spoke of as "lively pictures," painted to depict facts which, had his books and MSS. with ciphers been lost, hidden truths might yet come to light. Bacon in his *Advancement of Learning* says: "Life is short: *Art* is long." Also in a letter to Sir. Christopher Hatton, Bacon remarks "As Statues and *Pictures are dumb Histories*, so Histories are speaking pictures."

This Rainbow picture bears the inscription "*Sine Solis Non Iris*" a pretty obvious remark unless it bears a second meaning viz: "No beautiful Queen (*Reine beau* to keep the pun) without a son." The Queen's lovely pink robe is covered with eyes and ears! surely a strange form of decoration? but *not* when we remember that the Queen nicknamed many of her favourites, and that Oxford was called "her Turk," Simier "her Monkey" d'Alençon "her Frog," Hatton her "Mutton," and curiously enough Robert Dudley (later Leicester) was "her Eyes!" In one of his many letters to the Queen he uses this symbol no less than three times, ô ô ending his epistle "Your devoted ô ô, so one may conjecture that the eyes on the Queen's robe point to Robert Dudley as father of her sons. Old Mother Dowe of Brentford was amongst others who suffered for saying the Queen had children by Dudley, and a man named Markham lost his ears for spreading the same tale. Had these rumours been mere idle gossip it seems unlikely that an important foreign painter would be employed to paint "ears and eyes" on a Queen's robe? Rumours of the Queen's infatuation for Robert Dudley had spread to every Court in Europe and caused her Ministers much anxiety, in fact it was said that a secret marriage had taken place between them. This might be the reason which prevented the Queen from accepting the many offers of marriage she received from foreign princes, and had such a marriage taken place it would justify the Queen's words that nothing wrong had taken place between her and Robert Dudley. In 1571 a Bill was passed which was divided into two parts, and by the second part it



became High Treason for any subject to say who ought to be her successor on the Throne (Lingard, Vol. 6, page 120).

There was also sent to Mary Queen of Scots a mission from Elizabeth to persuade Mary to forego any claim to the English Throne. Mary would only consent on condition that the deed contained the words "*lawful issue*" in each place. Elizabeth was angry at this and the words were changed to "any issue by a lawful husband." Elizabeth would never again allow the expression as used in the Statute of the 1st of her reign "heirs lawfully to be begotten," and this was substituted by "*natural issue of her body*," a curious form of words for a *Virgin Queen* to employ? Again after death Elizabeth's body was not embalmed as was the rigorous custom in those days for Sovereigns, and her Maids of Honour attended to the burial preparations. A strange paragraph appears in "*Albion's England*" by W. Warner, Imprinted for George Petter, London 1606, at the Sign of the Bible:

"England's heirs apparent have of Wales bin Princes till our Queen deceased, conceal'd her heir, I wot not for what skill."<sup>1</sup>

Then we find in Viscount Mersey's "*A picture of Life*" 1872-1940, a diary entry which reads "Lady Wakehurst (Lady Louise Loder) told me of an account of a confinement of Queen Elizabeth being found among the Archives at Windsor. It was given to Queen Victoria, who burnt it saying that it was Queen Elizabeth's private affair." Certainly it would appear from these facts that Queen Elizabeth bore a child, and as she showered titles, lands and privileges on Robert Dudley, whose grandfather, father and brothers all died as traitors, there must have been some concealed reason for her faithfulness right to the end of her life towards him? Dudley's reputed conduct towards other women would not lead us to suppose that this intimate friendship with the Queen was purely platonic, especially as Elizabeth herself said of him "he can change into all colours except white, which is that of innocency" and she of all human beings knew Dudley best. It would also be difficult to presume that the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn was cold as ice? If all these implications are taken into consideration it would seem to point to the fact that Queen Elizabeth bore a child to Robert Dudley, but since many deeds and letters which would have an important bearing on the subject have been destroyed or lost, it seems unlikely now that truth so long hidden will ever be revealed by those in authority. Disraeli wrote in "*Sybil*" 1845, "If ever the History of England be written by one who has the knowledge and the courage, and both qualities are equally requisite for the undertaking, the world would be more astonished than when reading the Roman Annals by Nieburh. Generally speaking, all the great events have been dis-

<sup>1</sup>Skill=reason in Elizabethan English.

torted, most of the important events concealed, some of the principal characters never appear, and all who figure are so misunderstood and misrepresented that the result is a complete mystification and the perusal about as profitable to an Englishman as the reading of the Republic of Plato or the Utopia of More . . .” Many writers now agree that the Sonnets are dynastic in tone and were addressed to Queen Elizabeth, for to whom else could the author of Sonnet 125 write: “Were it aught to me I bore the canopy”? Again “why write I ever the same” *Semper eadem* being the Queen’s motto, points to this sonnet being addressed to her. In sonnet 13 we find the words: “You had a father: let your son say so.” Presuming the Sonnets were addressed to the Queen, this line would be pointless unless she had given birth to a son. Again in Sonnet 163 “. . . play the mother’s part. . .” certainly indicates that the woman addressed had borne a live child? Whether Francis Bacon himself was a son of Queen Elizabeth is a question much discussed by the Baconians, many of them believe Mrs. Gallup’s deciphered story as well as Dr. Orville Owen’s, to be correct and several other allegorical pictures exist with captions, each one helping us to solve the problem of Elizabeth’s private life which was certainly an enigma.

Of deciphering Bacon wrote: “It is time to come from the *talk* about things to the *observation* (seeing with one’s eyes) of the things themselves.” “He who neglects *small* things, will never discover *great*.” Therefore these little eyes and ears portrayed on “The Rainbow” picture may help to solve the much discussed problem of the Virgin Queen. It has often been asked “who do the three figures on the base of the Monument to Shakespeare in Westminster Abbey represent?” and so far no answer has been forthcoming—so may it be presumed that these figures are Queen Elizabeth, Robert Dudley, and Bacon *crowned*, and divulge the hidden truth that Bacon ought to have been King of England?



# WAS SHAKESPEARE EDUCATED?

By W. G. C. GUNDRY

## PART II

In his former article on this subject Mr. Gundry analysed and examined the arguments of critics and certain famous men who, faced with the fact that Shakespeare wrote the most wonderful plays on a vast variety of subjects employing an immense knowledge of classic writers and other subjects, and using a vocabulary of 21,000 words, said he was not educated but divined his knowledge by intuition. Describing such an imaginary figure as a monstrosity, the author in his concluding article gives the other side of the picture.

**W**HAT sort of a man was Francis Bacon? He has been traduced in the most shameful manner by some modern writers, such as Macaulay, but it is suggested that his contemporaries are better witnesses to his character than these.

Let us hear how his friends describe him: Dr. Rawley, his first and last chaplain, begins his short life of his master thus:

"Francis Bacon, the glory of his age and nation, the adorning and ornament of learning, was born in York House, or York Place, in the Strand, on the two and twentieth day of January in the year of our Lord 1560. . . . His first and childish years were not without some mark of eminency; at which time he was endued with that pregnancy and towardness of wit, as they were presages of that deep and universal apprehension which was manifest in him afterward; and caused him to be taken notice of by several persons of worth and place, and especially by the Queen."

It is said that no man is a hero to his valet, how much less to his chaplain! and yet Dr. Rawley throughout his short life of Bacon continues in the same strain of admiration; nor is he alone in these encomiums.

Listen to his friend and literary critic, Sir Tobie Mathew:

"A man so rare in knowledge of so many several kinds, endued with the facility and felicity of expressing it all, in so elegant, significant, so abundant, and yet so choice and ravishing a way of words, of metaphors, and allusions, as perhaps the world hath not seen, since it was a world. I know this may seem a great hyperbole, and strange kind of riotous excess of speech, but the best means of putting me to shame will be for you to place any other man of yours by this of mine."

And again:—

"It is not his greatness that I admire, but his virtue; it is not the favours I have received from him (infinite though they be) that have thus enthralled and enchained my heart, but his whole life and character; which are such that were he of an inferior condition I could not honour him the less, and if he

were mine enemy I should not the less love and endeavour to serve him."

Hear Dr. Rawley again:—

"I have been induced to think, that if there were a Beam of Knowledge derived from God upon any Man in these Modern Times, it was upon him."

and also:

"His meals were refections of the Ear as well as of the Stomach, like the *Noctes Attica*, or *Convivia Deipno-Sophistarum*, wherein a Man might be refreshed in his Mind and Understanding as no less than in his body. And I have known some, of no meal Parts, that have professed to make use of their Note Books, when they have risen from his Table."

Now we will call Ben Jonson to testify to the abilities of his friend Francis Bacon:

"Yet there hapn'd in my time one noble *Speaker*, who was full of gravity in his speaking. His language (where he could spare, or passe by a jest) was nobly censorious. No man ever spake more neatly, more presly, more weightily, or suffer'd lesse emptinesse, lesse idlenesse, in what hee utter'd. No member of his speech, but consisted of his owne graces: His hearers could not cough, or looke aside from him, without losse. Hee commanded where hee spoke; and had his Judges angry, and pleased at his devotion. No man had their affections more in his power. The feare of every man that heard him, was, lest hee should make an end."

We could add many more similar tributes to Bacon's superlative gifts, but these must suffice for the moment.

It may be reasonably objected that these opinions entertained by Bacon's contemporaries, although illustrating his agreeable qualities and eloquence, do not identify him as the author of the Shakespeare Plays; that is true, though they do reveal a man with the attributes which we would expect the writer of them to possess.

Let us now proceed to produce reasons for such identification.

"In 1607 Bacon wrote a tract in Latin called *Cogitata et Visa* which was a forerunner of his *Novum Organum*; this was not published until twenty-seven years after his death. In 1857 Mr. Spedding discovered a manuscript of this work in the Library of Queen's College, Oxford, and it contained passages concerning representations of the human passions, which had been suppressed in the printed edition."<sup>1</sup>

In it Bacon says this is to be effected by means of "*visible representations*" and goes on to say:—

"Nothing else can be devised that would place in a clearer light what is true and what is false, or show more plainly that what is presented is more than words."

and he adds that when these writings have been "put forth and seen":

<sup>1</sup>See "*Shakespeare, New Views for Old*," by R. L. Eagle, pp. 17, 18.



"He does not doubt that more timid wits will shrink almost in despair from imitating them with similar productions, with other materials or on other subjects; and they will take so much delight in the specimens given that they will miss the precepts in them. Still, many persons will be led to inquire into the real meaning and highest use of these writings, and to find the Key to their interpretation, and thus more ardently desire, in some degree at least, to acquire the new aspect of nature which such Key will reveal. But he intends yielding neither to his own aspirations nor to the wishes of others, but keeping steadily in view the success of his undertaking, having shared these writings with some, to withhold the rest until the treatise intended for the people shall be published."

This pretty accurately described the Shakespeare Plays; we know that many new plays were published in the First Folio of 1623, seven years after Shakespeare's death. An interesting commentary on the above is furnished by the following opinions of eminent men who detect similarities between Bacon's and Shakespeare's style:

"There is something about Bacon's diction, his quaintness of expression, and his power of illustration, which lays hold of the mind, and lodges itself in the memory, in a way which we hardly find paralleled in any other author, except it be Shakespeare."—*Professor Fowler* in his Introduction to Bacon's *Novum Organum*.

"The wisdom displayed in Shakespeare is equal in profoundness to the great Lord Bacon's *Novum Organum*."—*Hazlitt*.

"There is an understanding manifested in the construction of Shakespeare's plays equal to that in Bacon's *Novum Organum*."

—*Carlyle*.

To effect this teaching it was necessary to suppress his name as has been noted by Mr. Parker Woodward writing on Bacon's *New Method*:—

"Directly men were aware that the main purpose of the published plays was not so much to entertain them as to put them to school, the *New Method* was certain to become a failure. Long and patient trial of the system could alone attain success. To disclose the author was to reveal the schoolmaster, whose work would be resented as an impertinence by those for whom it was most fit."

It appears therefore that there were very cogent reasons for the suppression of Bacon's name as the author of the plays. The pseudonym "William Shakespeare" has been so well managed that the average scholar is still under the illusion of his authorship, and hence literary criticism has been led into strange by-ways.

The so-called mile-stones which are said to mark the alleged advance of orthodox Shakespearean criticism have in many cases become nothing more than mill-stones about the necks of the critics, which drown them in a sea of conjecture and faulty inference.

A solution of the difficulties with which the problem of author-

ship abounds, for those who regard the Stratford actor as responsible for the Plays, is provided by substituting Francis Bacon for him.

H. H. Furness, the Editor of the *Variorum Shakespeare*, wrote:—

“Had these plays come down to us anonymously, had the labour of discovering the author been imposed upon future generations, we could have found no one of that day but Francis Bacon to whom to assign the crown. In this case it would have been resting upon his head by common consent.”

We would lose nothing in the substitution of names:—

“What’s in a name? that which we call a rose,  
By any other name would smell as sweet;  
So Romeo would, were he not Romeo called,  
Retain that dear perfection which he owes, (owns)  
Without that title:—Romeo, doff thy name,  
And for that name, *which is no part of thee*  
Take all myself.”

—*Romeo and Juliet*, Act 2, Sc. ii.

Baconians do not depend upon one fact to demonstrate their contention but upon numerous ones, which are constantly being added to and brought to light as research probes ever deeper into the piebald miscellany of fictions which support the Stratford case—fictions which on their reverse face become factors in support of the Baconian thesis. In 1867 during the demolition of Northumberland House in the Strand a manuscript was discovered, now known as the *Northumberland Manuscript*. On the outer cover of it appear the names of “ffrauncis Bacon” and “William Shakespeare” together with various scribbings which include “*Richard the second*,” “*Richard the third*,” “*Essaies by the same author*,” “*honorificabilitudini*” and a quotation:—“revealing day through every crany peepes,” which is similar to the line:—“revealing day through every cranny spies,” in *Lucrece* together with other significant notes. It consists of about twenty-two sheets.

It is of interest to recall that Northumberland House was built by Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton and that it was completed at the beginning of the reign of James I. The builder of this mansion was a son of the Earl of Surrey, the poet who sang the praises of the fair Geraldine, and grandson of the Duke of Norfolk.

Lady Bacon, mother of Anthony and Francis wrote of him, “a dangerous intelligencing man.” The reader must draw his or her own conclusions from the scribbling on the *Northumberland Manuscript*. The average Shakespearean commentator does not appear to know of its existence; is there any reason for this silence?

In a postscript to a letter written about 1620 Sir Tobie Mathew writes to Bacon:

“The most prodigious wit that ever I knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship’s name, though he be known by another.”



In Bacon's *Apology Concerning Essex* occurs the following passage:—

"Hereupon the next news that I heard was, that we were all sent for again, and that her Majesty's pleasure was, we all should have parts in the business; and the Lords falling in distribution of our parts, it was allotted to me, that I should set forth some undutiful carriage of my Lord, in giving occasion and countenance to a seditious pamphlet, as it was termed, which was dedicated unto him, which was the book before-mentioned of *King Henry the Fourth*. Whereupon I replied to that allotment, and said to their Lordships, that it was an old matter, and had no manner of coherence with the rest of the charge, being matters of Ireland, and therefore that I having been wronged by bruits before, this would expose me to them more; and it would be said I gave in evidence mine own tales."

Though Bacon here refers to Dr. Hayward's:—"Book of *King Henry IV*" (called earlier in the "*Apology*" a "*a Story of the First Year of King Henry IV*"), the whole passage is significant and ambiguous.

Interesting and significant as these facts are they are far surpassed in this respect by the publication of thirty-two Latin elegies to Bacon's memory shortly after his death, known collectively as "*Manes Verulamiani*."<sup>2</sup>

These tributes to Bacon's surpassing genius have been largely overlooked by scholars, particularly those of the Stratford faith!

The copy in the British Museum is the only one to be recorded in the Bibliographical Society's *Short Title Catalogue*. It seems probable that the little book was printed privately and not in the ordinary way; it was entered in the Stationers' Register "to Mistris Griffin and J. Haviland," 7th May, 1626.

As Bacon died on 9th April preceding, these poems must have been written and printed rather hurriedly. No amount of special pleading or scholarly casuistry can explain away the implications contained in the elegies.

They particularly draw attention to Bacon's claims to be considered:—

- (1) A supreme poet.
- (2) The writer of unacknowledged literary works.
- (3) As being associated with the theatre.
- (4) The centre of a mystery which it was reserved for posterity to reveal.

The writers appear to have exercised great ingenuity in hinting at, and in some cases boldly stating, the truth concerning Bacon, but usually with an air of restraint, which suggests that they were under some obligation not to make too direct a statement that Bacon and Shakespeare were one and the same person. In some cases they come very near to doing so, notably in the last Elegy (XXXII) where

<sup>2</sup>These are shortly to be published in facsimile with translations by the Bacon Society.

## WAS SHAKESPEARE EDUCATED?

Thomas Randolph alludes to "The Spear of Quirinus" (*Hasta Quirini*). As the late Father Sutton, S.J., writes in his notes to his translations of the *Manes*, which have twice appeared in *BACONIANA*:

"*Quirinus* is supposed to be derived from the Sabine word *quiris*, meaning a lance or spear, *Quirinus* would therefore mean spearman. That there is here an allusion to Bacon's *nom de guerre*, Shakespeare, no one who knows who the dramatist really was can doubt. The lance which he brandished and hurled at ignorance (Ben Jonson's famous prefatory poem to the *First Folio* compares Shakespeare's works to this lance) took root and became a laurel tree, thereby supplying unending crowns of literary glory."

In his preface to the Great Instauration (*Instauratio Magna*) Bacon writes:—

"And the same humility which I use in inventing I employ likewise in teaching."

It was only by means of the stage that he could insinuate his philosophic teaching under the guise of drama into minds hitherto darkened and obscured by the fruitless philosophies of the schoolmen. It has been wisely written:—

"*Le vice radical de la philosophie c'est de ne pouvoir parler au cœur;*"

and this saying aptly sums up Bacon's reason for using the stage as a means of popularising his philosophy: he could not expect the majority to read or understand his philosophic writings, but he could appeal to the multitude by means of the stage and, being a moral philosopher, he understood well enough, that "the pen of the tongue should be dipped in the ink of the heart."

There is a complete consistency in these tributes to Bacon's memory which suggests that they were instigated by a desire to stimulate inquiry among the readers of them; this, perhaps, was their paramount purpose.

Elegy IV enforces what we already know and believe in regard to Bacon's connection with the stage, where he is described as renovating philosophy by means of Comedy and Tragedy: his share in writing masques for Gray's Inn is too well known to need repetition here, as well as his part in their organisation. The translation runs:—

"As Eurydice wandering through the shades of Dis longed to caress Orpheus, so did Philosophy entangled in the subtleties of Schoolmen seek Bacon as a deliverer, with such winged hand as Orpheus lightly touched the lyre's strings, the Styx before scarce ruffled now at last bounding, with like hand stroked Philosophy raised high her crest; nor did he with workmanship of fussy meddlers patch, but he renovated her walking lowly in the shoes of Comedy. After that more elaborately he rises on the loftier tragic buskin, and the Stagirite [Aristotle] (like) Virbius comes to life again in the *Novum Organum*."



In Elegy XIII we read:—

“Something there is, which the next age will glory in;

Something there is, which it is fit, should be known to me alone.”

Space does not permit a more extended notice of these marvellous tributes to Bacon's genius: the reader is recommended to peruse them *in extenso*. He will find Bacon hailed as Apollo and the Tenth Muse among other tributes.

Bacon toiled ceaselessly amid all the distractions of office and after the terrible ordeal of his so-called “fall” for the relief of the Human Estate.

As Professor John Nicol says:—

“An activity so unparalleled neither the cares of office, nor illness, nor vexation of spirit, nor the shadow of disgrace, or age, could impede. His work as a lawyer and statesman would have filled a life had not his labours as a philosopher and a man of letters been sufficient to adorn it. With an energy like that of Scott after his ruin, he set himself to add fresh tiers to his enduring monument.”

Bacon deserves the gratitude of Posterity, whose servant he declared himself to be.

Commendation is a debt which we all owe to the abilities and labours of others for the general good, and this should be paid ungrudgingly by all whom malice has not made mute, or envy struck dumb, or prejudice prevented. Services which a generous heart and a noble mind have rendered Humanity have their own unseen heralds, and these will not be silenced, either by malice, envy, or prejudice; and though the trumpets of fame sound softly and may not be audible to every ear, yet when the merit is great and the debt universal, they will ultimately be heard throughout the world: these little-known thirty-two elegies sound such a paean.

They have so far received scant attention from the world at large, and orthodox Shakespearean scholars in particular. Why?

Some pages back the writer promised to give an instance of how orthodox critics have gone astray through mistaking the identity of the author, here it is:

In the opening lines of *Twelfth Night*, Act 1., Sc. 1, we read the well known passage:—

“That strain again! it had a dying fall:

O! it came o'er my ear like the sweet sound

That breathes upon a bank of violets

Stealing and giving odour.”

In Bacon's *Essay Of Gardens* we read:—

“And because the breath of flowers is far sweeter in the air, where it comes and goes like the warbling of music, than in the hand, therefore nothing is more fit for that delight, than to know what be the flowers and plants that do best perfume the air.”

In some editions of the play the word “sound” has been changed to “south,” quite unnecessarily.

Compare with the above:—

“To hear by the nose, it is dulcet in contagion”

—*Twelfth Night*, Act 2, Sc. 3.

and

“To hear with eyes belongs to love’s fine wit.”

—*Sonnet 23*.

The Shakespearean critics may blow a *Shaksperean* pipe but it plays a Baconian tune!

A rigid enthusiasm for Shakespearean scholastic orthodoxy cracks the sinews of truth and numbs the apprehension of anything above or beyond common expectation: it only concerns itself with the conventions of scholarship which makes a peradventure of facts outside the common range of experience and tends only to see one side of a question; it does not seek further knowledge which may lead to a recantation of hitherto held opinions; it wears merely formal mourning at the tomb of Truth and sheds no tears there; indeed, the tomes of some of these scholars are themselves the tombs of Truth.

The average Shakespearean scholar falls into trite or trivial disquisitions and futile expatiations on the plain facts of Shakespeare’s biography, whilst blanching or avoiding the obscure.

These petty biographical details which patient research has unearthed in the lumber-room of Shakspeare’s life have done little to enhance his reputed perfections, or to elevate him in popular esteem, and have added but faded plumes to the crest of scholarship.

And even where these researches yield provable facts the resultant biographical synthesis presents no plausible poet, nor one who can enlist our sympathy or respect, nor, indeed, render credible the alleged connection between Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon and the Shakespeare Plays: no equation is possible! Patent truth is an anvil for every scholastic hammer; hidden truth requires patient search and rigid investigation before being accounted authentic.

The mind discovers the author. When Francis Bacon was a youth of about eighteen Nicholas Hilliard painted his miniature and round it was written:—

“*Si tabula daretur digna animum malle.*”

(Could he but paint the mind).

This was the same mind of which Dr. Rawley writes:—

“His first and childish years were not without some mark of eminency.”

The same intellect which is portrayed in Roubilliac’s fine bust in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

“The marble index of a mind forever

Voyaging through strange seas of thought alone.”

—*Wordsworth* (of Newton).

It has been pointed out by the late Sir George Greenwood that the idealised portrait of Shakespeare by Ford Madox Brown “is nothing more nor less than a reproduction, with some variations, of Van Somer’s portrait of Francis Bacon which hangs at Gorhambury, and was engraved and published by Vertue in 1723.”



The smug-looking bust of Shakspeare in Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-on-Avon, probably dates from 1748-9, when alterations were made to the monument.

Baconians are sometimes accused of being "haters of the Man from Stratford."

Speaking for himself the present writer confesses to an admiration for his taciturnity, with so many temptations to open his mouth; we are only opposing "the mute omnipotence of prejudice" in the interests of the truth.

William Shakspeare was a necessary feature in the vast scheme of Bacon's philosophic experiment which has the world for its theatre, ages for its accomplishment and posterity for its beneficiaries! We conclude with Bacon's words:—

"It is enough for me that I have sown unto posterity and unto the Immortal God."

(NOTE.—The two articles now published in *BACONIANA* entitled "Was Shakespeare Educated?", with considerable additions by the author, Mr. W. G. C. Gundry, will be published shortly in book form, with illustrations, by the Bacon Society. This comprehensive and thoughtful work places on record for the first time in complete analysis, the whole question of the educational features of the Shakespearean plays, and seeks to prove that whilst genius may apply to many matters it cannot produce superlative knowledge of the classics, and other specialist acquirements, without the necessary learning.—EDITOR.)

To the Editor of *BACONIANA*  
Sir,

### HOW TRUE, HOW TRUE!

I visited Stratford the other day and whilst in New Place noticed an exhibit there which seemed to me to have a bearing on the authorship of the plays. I thought it was yet another subtle indication of Bacon to the effect that the man Shakspeare was merely a medium through which he transcribed his genius.

I cannot recall very accurately the majority of the writing matter on this exhibit, but took note of what seemed to be the most significant. It was a card or ticket giving admittance to the bearer to performances of Shakespeare's plays, and was headed, "Shakespeare's Jubilee at Stratford-on-Avon." The left hand side of the card was taken up by the full-length figure of Shakespeare leaning on a pedestal, and above his head were the significant words, "WE NE'ER SHALL LOOK UPON HIS LIKE AGAIN!"

Possibly this may not be of any great consequence, but I have not seen it mentioned in books concerning the authorship up to now. I also visited the Museum attached to the Theatre and was much amused by the remark of the attendant who, in answer to my query, "what do you think is the reason for the Droeshout portrait having two left arms?" replied, "er—some kind of a joke, I think, sir." How true, how true!

Yours faithfully,

JOHN GILBERT.

## A BACONIAN DISCOVERY

By JOHAN FRANCO

More than three centuries ago, to be exact, in 1634 and 1635, there was published *A collection of Emblemes Ancient and Moderne*, in four parts, by George Wither. In his foreword the author mentions that the two hundred engraved pictures were "graven in copper by Crispinus Passaeus" and "brought to view many years agoe." This emblem book is brimful of interest for Baconians. Maria Bauer found in here the clues which led to her discovery of the yet unopened but definitely located vault in Bruton's churchyard of Williamsburg, Virginia.

Just recently I came across an older book which immediately identified itself as the *source* of Wither's emblems. It was published in 1611 and the emblems are attributed to the Hollander Gabriel Rollenhagen or Rollenhague. There is no mention of or credit given to the engraver Passaeus mentioned by Wither, but here are unmistakably the originals of Wither's illustrations with their original plate numbers still on them, although the pagination of Wither's book does not correspond with the numbers on the engravings.

Comparing all two hundred emblems of Rollenhague's book with the same number in Wither's, it occurred to me that only one single emblem has been tampered with, that is, altered for some reason between 1611 and 1634. Emblem 64 of Rollenhague's volume shows a *burning* candle with a *bee*. Page 76 of Wither's book shows Rollenhague's emblem 64 with its plate number still on it, but the candle is *extinguished* and the bee is *gone*. Thus George Wither, an intimate friend of Sir Francis Bacon, has added a cunning and cryptic allusion to the death of Sir Francis to the innumerable obvious ones in his book.

Wither says in this manner that since the death of Sir Francis Bacon, the *light has been extinguished and the bee* ("B" of Bacon) *has gone*. (See *Illustrations facing and overleaf*).



A SIGNIFICANT EMBLEM OF THE CANDLE AND THE BEE



*COSI DE BEN AMAR PORTO TORMENTO*

*Et mor' ogn' hor' lieto è, Contento .*

*Musca velut sequitur flammam, ac se se inijcit igni*

*Sic Veneris itelis læta iuuenta perit .*

Emblem 64 of Rollenhagen's work of 1611, showing a burning candle and a bee. In Geogre Wither's collection of Emblems, (1634-5) is shown the same candle on the same table, but the candle is extinguished, and the Bee ("B" for Bacon) has gone. The Wither's emblem is reproduced on the following page.



ILLVSTR. XIII.

Book. 2

**H**ere be of those in every *Common-weale*,  
Whom to this *Emblem* we resemble may;  
The *Name* of none I purpose to reveale,  
But, their *Condition*, heere, I will display.  
Some, both by gifts of *Nature*, and of *Grace*,  
Are so prepared, that, they might be fit  
To stand as *Lights*, in profitable place;  
Yet, loose their *Talent*, by neglecting it.  
Some, to the *common Grace*, and *nat'raill parts*,  
(By helpe of *Nurture*, and good *Discipline*)  
Have added an accomplishment of *Arts*,  
By which, their *Light* may much the brighter shine.  
Some others, have to this, acquired more:  
For, to maintaine their *Lampe*, in giving light,  
Of *Waxe*, and *Oyle*, and *Fainesse*, they have store,  
Which over-flowes unto them, day and night.  
And, ev'n as *Lampes*, or *Candles*, on a *Table*,  
(Or, fixt on golden *Candlesticks*, on high)  
To light *Assemblies*, Great and Honourable,  
They, oft, have (also) place of *Dignitie*.  
By meanes of which, their *Splendor* might become  
His praise, who those high favours did bequeath:  
They might encrease the *Lights* of *Christendome*,  
And, make them see, who sit in shades of *Death*.  
But, many of them, like those *Candles* bee;  
That stand unlighted in a *Branch* of gold:  
For, by their helpe wee nothing more can see,  
Than wee in grossest darknesse, may behold.  
If such there be, (as there bee such, I feare)  
The question is, *For what good use they are.*

# FRANCIS BACON'S DIARY: "SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS"

By ALFRED DODD

## PART III

[Mr. Alfred Dodd, in this the third and last part of his article on the Sonnets, gives us a fascinating analytical account of how he claims that the 1609 Quarto Edition of the Sonnets was not printed or published on that date, and that it was not published or publicly known until 1766. —ED.]

WE can now proceed by direct evidence to prove

1. That the Sonnets were printed after the death of Shaksper in 1616
2. That Benson's Medley of 1640 was the first Sonnet Edition published to the world.
3. That the "1609 Quarto" was absolutely unknown to Layman and Scholar until 1766.

The first witness on the Stand that we can call is Nicholas Rowe, the first biographer of Shaksper of Stratford, in 1709, for he is the first person to refer to the Sonnets at all . . . exactly ONE HUNDRED YEARS after the alleged publication of the "1609 Quarto." On the last page, in a paragraph that stands by itself very noticeably he writes:—

"There is a Book of Poems published in 1640 *under the Name of Mr. William Shakespeare*, but as I have but very lately seen it, . . . I won't pretend to determine whether they be his or no."

So, because the Book of Poems, the Sonnets, is published in 1640, after Shaksper's death in 1616, he won't pretend to determine whether they be his or not. By his silence he knows nothing, so far as the world is concerned, of any "1609 Quarto" publication containing the same Sonnets as the 1640 edition, published in 1609. Had there been such a collection of 154 Sonnets in evidence sold openly in the markets of the world and circulating in the Halls of Learning for one hundred years, known to have been published in Shaksper's lifetime, there would have been no question of determining whether such poems, the Sonnets, were written by him or not, and Rowe could not have raised so pointedly the issue of their genuineness and authenticity.

The fact is, Rowe is telling the reader plainly that he wants it to be understood that he knows nothing of any Sonnet publication in 1609, or prior to Shaksper's decease, but only the 1640 Edition issued after his death "UNDER THE NAME OF WIL. Shakespeare Gent." Rowe, as a Rosicrucian, knows well the secret of the "1609 Quarto" but he is merely writing a life of Shaksper the Mask. The first open mention then, of Shakespeare's Sonnets after Shaksper's death, is not to the "1609 Quarto" but only to the 1640 Book of Poems, Benson's Medley. Rowe's remarks were the first steps on the rugged road which later critics have found so thickly beset with thorny problems.



Five years later, 1714, Rowe edited Shakespeare's Works. The Ninth Volume deals exclusively with Shakespeare's Miscellaneous Poems. It contains an unsigned article entitled, "Critical Remarks on his Plays and Poems." It is said to have been written by a well known literary man a Mr. Charles Gildon, a friend of Rowe's. They were therefore both jointly responsible. It was published so that later ages might know that in 1714, the poems and Sonnets of Shakespeare were limited to the 1640 Edition, the "1609 Quarto" being unknown. His "Remarks" are of the utmost importance yet they have been ignored and smothered by every Stratfordian authority. The evidence came into my hands through the presentation to me of a copy of the work by the former esteemed secretary Mr. H. Seymour, to whom the Bacon Society in particular and the world in general owe a very deep debt. Charles Gildon makes the most significant statements in seeking to prove that the Sonnets are genuine, though unknown when the Great Folio of 1623 was published, for he states that *they appeared after Shaksper's death in 1616.*

The "Remarks" begin with a reference to the "Benson Medley" of 1640.

"*They are of a piece with the rest of his works . . . I have given them so much attention that I could not easily be imposed upon by any spurious Copy of that Poet . . . There is not one of them that does not carry its AUTHOR'S MARK AND STAMP upon it.*"

(Note the reference to the Rosicrosse Seals . . . "Mark and Stamp").

"There is the same mode of Dress and Expression . . . peculiar sort of Epithets which distinguish his from all the Verses of his contemporaries as in the Poem, "From off a Hill whose concave Womb reworded," etc.

(Note: This is from "A Lover's Complaint" already mentioned and was an integral part of the "1609 Quarto.")

Gildon continues with this remarkable statement: "There is next the Objection, that *if these Poems had been genuine, they had been PUBLISHED IN THE LIFE-TIME OF THE AUTHOR AND BY HIMSELF!* but coming out ALMOST THIRTY YEARS AFTER HIS DEATH, there is great reason to suspect that they are not GENUINE."

We thus get direct proof that "A Lover's Complaint," specially mentioned by the 1714 Editor, because he knew it was an integral part of the "1609 Quarto," was unknown to the world at the time of the Author's death—whether Shaksper in 1616 or Shakespeare in 1626—and that it was recognised as an accepted literary and historic fact by the literary and scholastic world in 1714 that the Sonnets were likewise posthumous poems. If a "Lover's Complaint" in 1640 CAME OUT (of Hiding) almost THIRTY YEARS after his death, so, too, did the Sonnets, the 154 Sonnets of the "1609 Quarto" or the same Sonnets intermixed in the Benson Medley.

Poems like "Crabbed Age and Youth," "Lucrece," etc. were universally recognised as having been published in the Author's lifetime. Rowe and Gildon's argument therefore refers, *and can only refer* to the posthumous Sonnets which veiled the personality of the real Author.

The evidence of the First Shakespearean Critics and Scholars, who lived two hundred years nearer the truth of the matter than Modernists like the Robertsons and the Lees, is CLEAR, UNEQUIVOCAL and EMPHATIC. They were not "Published in the Lifetime of the Author." They came out "almost Thirty years after his death." And that posterity may not mistake his meaning, he goes a step further. He says:—

"If nothing was to be thought his but WHAT WAS PUBLISHED IN HIS LIFETIME, much the greater number of his Plays would be as liable to this objection as his Poems."

"There is no weight in the objection. Is there anything more common, than THE PUBLICATION OF WORKS of Great Men AFTER THEIR DEATH?"

"No! No! There is a Likeness . . . IN THE CHILDREN OF THE BRAIN when they are begot by a genius indeed. Besides, these Poems being mostly to his MISTRESS, it is not at all unlikely that she kept them by her till they fell into her EXECUTOR'S HANDS, or some FRIENDS WHO WOULD NOT LET THEM BE CONCEALED ANY LONGER."

Thus our Rosicrosse Brethren Rowe and Gildon leave a monumental and unassailable record that the Sonnets were privately dedicated to Pallas Athena, the Diarist's "Tenth Muse" by whom the Author begot his literary child, the Shakespeare Folio, his Mistress from the Author's youthful days at Grays Inn where the Law Students swore fealty to her as "Knights of the Helmet." The Rosicrosse being Pallas Athena's literary executors had published to the world in 1640 the Sonnets which had hitherto been reserved to the Secret Fraternities. The Heads "would not let them BE CONCEALED any longer" says Gildon who again reiterates in another form that the Sonnets were published after Shaksper's death. These "Executors or Friends" "were none other than the "Grand Possessors" (mentioned in the Troilus and Cressida Preface) who held the Shakespeare Manuscripts.

Had the Quarto been printed in 1609, there would have been no necessity to have justified Shakespeare's authorship of the Sonnets since it would have been known in 1714. In fact, it would never have occurred to anyone to raise such an issue as publication after 1616. The argument of Rowe and Gildon based on literary internal evidence would have been so beside the mark that the literary men of 1714 would have told them plainly that the Sonnets were published seven years before the Author's death. It was an era that particularly prided itself on exposing literary shams, yet the outstanding fact remains that this important pronouncement is received by the literary world without dispute. The argus-eyed critics see nothing to cavil at. The silence of an army of pamphleteers is due to the fact that in 1714 it was regarded as the historic truth that the Sonnets were indeed published after Shaksper's death, and that, in the absence of Manuscripts, one could only argue as Rowe and Gildon—on internal evidence of the text.

Rowe's Edition of the Sonnets follows closely the Benson Medley of 1640, to which is affixed the article in question—the clear aim being to get them accepted as genuine remains of the Poet, there being no mention of the "1609 Quarto."

Eleven years afterwards Dr. Sewell published an Edition of Shakespeare's Poems as a supplementary volume to Pope's Edition of the Plays. What Dr. Sewell did and wrote was therefore with the approval of the greatest literary man of his day, Pope the Poet. There is a subtle reference to Rosicrosse-Masonry in Sewell's Preface. And in order to associate himself with the literary standpoint of Messrs Rowe and Gildon he adopts the most striking method a man of letters could choose. He simply reprints the volume of poems they edited and actually reprints in full the "CRITICAL REMARKS." He adds these significant words:—"Mr. Gildon uses many arguments to prove them genuine but the best is the Style, Spirit, and Fancy of Shakespeare."

There is not a word in the Pope-Sewell Edition that the Sonnets were published in 1609 which would have been a decisive argument in their favour. The best argument, according to Dr. Sewell, is internal evidence. It is purely a literary problem . . . not a personal. The "1609 Quarto" is still unknown in Sewell's day: There is but the 1640 Medley in Sight.

Thus the first four witnesses voluntarily testify without equivocation that the Sonnets were published after Shaksper's death, with the necessary corollary by their silence that they know nothing openly of any Sonnet publication in 1609.

We can now call a succession of witnesses for the next fifty years whose silence proclaims that they know nothing of the "1609 Quarto." These witnesses are Shakespearean editors—keen on finding out all about the man. The startling fact emerges that the "1609 Quarto" is never reprinted by them, is unknown by them, and of course unnoticed; and that the only edition of the poems that is reprinted for long years is the 1640 Benson Medley.

In 1733, Lewis Theobald published an edition. Says Samuel Butler, "He had evidently never seen the Quarto." He says nothing about it.

Between 1698 and 1779 lived Dr. Warburton who wrote voluminously on Shakespeare. But he says nothing about the Sonnets. He is apparently unaware of the existence of the Quarto.

In 1767 Dr. Farmer wrote "On the Learning of Shakespeare" but he has nothing to say about the "1609 Quarto" and its personal problems.

In 1768 Edward Capell produced a ten volume Edition, the work of twenty years but he gives no sign that he had ever heard of the "1609 Quarto."

In 1768 Thomas Tyrwhitt devoted his life to Shakespearean study producing many notes and glossaries. But he wrote nothing bearing on the Sonnets. He apparently knows nothing of the "1609 Quarto" and its personal problems.

In 1771 Dr. Samuel Johnson edited the Plays. The final volume consisted entirely of the "1640 Benson Medley." He is silent regarding the "1609 Quarto."

In 1774 Messrs. Bell and Etherington publish the Plays. Like other editors they reprint the Benson Medley and there is still no mention of the Quarto.

In 1785 was published Masson's Comments but there is no mention of the Sonnets or any personal problem.

In 1785 and 1803 were printed Reed's Advertisements to Shakespeare. Neither the Sonnets nor the Quarto nor any personal problem is referred to.

In 1789 appears Mr. Colman's Translations. But the Sonnets are not mentioned nor the Quarto nor any suggestion of any personal problem.

In 1749 in Mr. Richardson's "Proposals" the Sonnets, the Quarto and the Personal Problems are still left severely alone.

In 1797, three years later, with the advent of a work by Mr. George Chalmers, we find that the problem of the sugar'd Sonnets, of which Meres spoke in 1598, has at last come before the eyes of the literary world. The Book was the culmination of an attack on a recognised authority, Malone, and in its train came the first of the series of problems still being threshed out to-day . . . "Who was Mr. W. H.? Who was T.T.?" etc.

To understand the position, and the way in which the "1609 Quarto" spread itself into the world and superseded gradually the Benson Medley, it is necessary to retrace one's steps thirty years to find the culprit who set the Quarto Seeds, watered them, and patiently waited for the Dragon's Teeth, to grow into the armed men who have been fighting so furiously in the pages of the Commentators for the last hundred years.

In 1766 George Steevens reprinted twenty old Quarto copies in four volumes. He was a dramatic critic and biographer, a literary co-worker with Samuel Johnson who describes him as a mischievous fellow. He concocted the famous legend of the death-dealing terrors of the upas tree which so completely hoaxed the naturalist, Erasmus Darwin, says Chambers encyclopedia, which adds that he was "Prone to Literary Mystification." He mystified and hoaxed similarly the Shakespearean Professors of his day. The way in which he writes with double meanings, his jibes, his caustic provocative remarks show that he was a member of Francis Bacon's Secret Society and had been put up—to bring the "1609 Quarto" to the notice of the Literary world.

In the "Advertisement" to the "Twenty Old Quarto Reprints" he writes:

"I have likewise reprinted 'Shakespeare's Sonnets' from a copy published in 1609 by G. Eld, one of the printers of his Plays, which, added to the consideration that they made their appearance *in his lifetime*, seems to be no slender proof of their authenticity."

Now THIS IS THE FIRST MENTION OF THE "1609 Quarto" in English Literature. It is the first time (1766) that any writer claimed that the Sonnets of Shakespeare were published in the lifetime of the supposed author, more than 140 years after its alleged publication in 1609 a claim now made so arrogantly by critics unaware of all the facts. There was never a whisper that such a book was in existence all through these years—when everything relating to Shakespeare was searched for and devoured with avidity—because no one knew of it outside the few custodians of the "Greatest Literary Secret" for all time, of whom Steevens was one. The claim is made on the strength of the Number, "1609" at the bottom of the Title page. It is apparently a matter of no moment



# SONNETS

To Sundry NOTES of  
MUSICK.E.

---

By Mr. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

---



---

L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year 1599.

L  
.

One of the 3 facsimile Title pages of *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, "To Sundry Notes of Music," dated 1599. For further description see over page.



# SONNETS

TO

Sundry NOTES

OF

# MUSICK E.

---

By Mr. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

---

L O N D O N

Printed in the Year 1609

# SONNETS

To sundry notes of Musicke.



AT LONDON

Printed for W. Iaggard, and are  
to be sold by W. Leake, at the Grey-  
hound in Paules Churchyard,

1599.

## THE SONNETS TO SUNDRY NOTES OF MUSIC BY MR. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

These are the facsimile Title-Pages (with the previous page) of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* as they appeared in 1599 and 1609 according to Bernard Lintott, who reprinted them as a centenary edition for private circulation in 1709. In the *Passionate Pilgrim* were printed the *Sonnets* with their own separate Title Page. There is good reason to believe that they were also printed separately as a booklet . . . "SONNETS to Sundry notes of Musicke." Note how the word SONNETS is thrown up in large letters. The fact that these "Sonnets" ran into three editions—1599, 1609, 1612—shows that they were a selling proposition; and they go far to disprove that the Edition known as the "1609 Quarto," consisting of 154 Sonnets, was in being in 1609 or that the copy of "*Shake-speare's Sonnets*" alleged to have been bought by Alleyn was the "1609 Quarto." He could only have purchased a copy of the "*Sonnets to Sundry Notes of Music*" which was definitely on sale in that year. It is a perfectly gratuitous assumption for anyone to assert that Alleyn bought a copy of the "1609 Quarto."

WHEN it was published to the literary generation of Steevens, for the Sonnets, owing to Messrs. Rowe, Gildon, Pope and Sewell, have long been accepted as part and parcel of the Shakespeare Canon. In this manner the "1609 Quarto" is reprinted; AND FOR THE FIRST TIME THE ACTUAL QUARTO IS OPENLY PUBLISHED, Steevens slyly hinting that it is, however, open to question whether his editors ought not "to leave out what may be a disgrace to him." Fourteen years pass. Not one Shakespearean Critic takes any notice of the "1609 Quarto." Then in 1780 a barrister named Edward Malone published the Quarto Sonnets and arbitrarily alters the text to suit his own ideas, setting an example followed by every subsequent editor of the Sonnets so that we now have a thoroughly vicious and corrupted Quarto text. The Shakespeare critics and editors *still* take no notice of the "1609 Quarto." They continue to print the "1640 Medley" and view the Quarto with suspicion. Ten years later, 1790, Malone writes somewhat bitterly . . .

"It is extraordinary that none of Shakespeare's various Editors have ever taken the trouble to compare them (the Sonnets) with the earliest and most authentic copies."

Malone has fallen into the Steevens trap. The earliest and most authentic copy of the Sonnets is the "1609 Quarto." He blindly accepts Steevens bland assurance that they made their appearance in Shaksper's lifetime and passes the error down to posterity. He is as fatally hoaxed as was Erasmus Darwin by the Steevens story of the Upas Tree. But the "1609 Quarto" is still ignored . . . though the reign of the Benson Medley is running to a close having served its impersonal purpose and held the field of literature for 150 years.

Three years later, 1793, Steevens reprints Shakespeare's works and acts the part of agent provocateur by writing:—

"We have not reprinted the Sonnets . . . the strongest act of Parliament that could be framed would fail to compel readers into their service. Their only intelligent editor, Mr. Malone, is disgraced . . . by the objects of their culture . . . If Shakespeare had produced no other works than these, his name would have reached us with as little celebrity than Watson . . . a more elegant Sonneteer."

This scathing attack had the effect of drawing Malone into a defence of the Sonnets though he deprecated the morals of the Author, who, he says, stood a self-confessed libertine, having abandoned his wife for the embraces of a wanton. So the cat had been set among the pigeons at last. The suggestion of Shakespeare's Sensualism had been openly mooted. Other commentators were being drawn in and by 1821 with the advent of Chalmers and Dr. Drake, and the joint Sonnet Comments in that year by Steevens, Malone, Boswell, the bitter criticisms of Steevens had borne fruit and the controversy as to the meaning of the Sonnets had begun.

We thus see that in 1766 Steevens simply disinters a completely buried work of art preserved by the Secret Elizabethan Literary Society. FOR THE FIRST TIME he openly places the Literary Sphinx in the Market Place and in the Halls of Learning. It straddles across the paths of humanity. To the busy tribes of men and women, to the Scholar, and to the generations that come and gaze and pass and go, it propounds the Egyptian Riddle of the Ages—"WHOM SAY MEN THAT I AM?" The plan of the Author had been successfully accomplished by his secret disciples after the passage of many years. In the absence of Manuscripts Francis Bacon's Secret Society had set the world a Sonnet Problem—THE PERSONAL IDENTITY OF THE AUTHOR.

There was a reprint by Lintott of the "1609 Quarto" undated, said to be in 1709. It was a secret reprint. The title pages were all doctored in a marvellous manner to prove that the "Sonnets to Sundry Notes of Musick" were verifiably described as "Shakespeare's Sonnets" in 1609.

I think the majority here will agree with me that this closely-linked network of facts—never previously disclosed by any writer—allows of no escape from the definite conclusion that the Sonnets were privately published after 1609, and some time prior to 1640, the Benson Medley. The truth-seeker can therefore proceed on firm ground to examine the Quarto on the lines of "IN-



TERNAL EVIDENCE." We shall find at once that the traditional Quarto Order is not at all correct—the "Will Sonnets" prove that conclusively—indeed there have been many attempts since 1821 to reconstruct them by Stratfordians and to find the true order. The weakness of all the Rearrangements is this: they throw absolutely no further light on the personal life of the reputed author. In Sir Denys Bray's work and Lord Alfred Douglas, we have still the Dark Lady and the Lovely Boy. The truth is that behind all this "Make-Believe" of Procreation, Jealousy, Harlotry, and Sodomy, there is a story that will throw new light ON A COMPLETE LIFE which must begin with the pen of a youth, "MY PUPIL PEN" and end with the Sere and Yellow of Old Age, the *Quarto Order* being deliberately designed to show merely the portrait of the "Shadow of a Shade" Man. *The world has hitherto been deceived by a superimposed picture which hides the true one.*

Much, then, depends on finding the true order. It can be found, approximately, in many ways—by textual internal evidence, by the same music beats in Sonnets far apart, by a Capital Letter Code, by the Elizabethan Art of Felling, by a numerical letter Key. One clinches the other. I found the True Order—or, rather, the True Order Found me—and with it the Various Themes so intertwined in the Quarto. I have never had any reason to doubt the truth of certain private information I received. Indeed, all my subsequent research work has gone to prove the correctness of the volume of Rearranged Sonnets I published in 1931 and which is steadily spreading its message over the Seven Seas. There are Sonnets which refer to the Great Folio of 1623, proving that the Quarto must have been printed after that date; and to the Masonic fraternity mentioning certain Masonic Signs and Secrets telling them to bury the Book and bury his Name. Since I know that Shaksper of Stratford was not a Mason this definitely rules out Shaksper and lets someone else in—a concealed poet. The only person in that era who was a concealed poet—on his own avowal and the avowal of the writers in the "Manes Verulamiani"—was the man Francis Bacon—who was also a Freemason and the Founder of the Craft.

With this mysterious personality you are all familiar. He is said to have been Queen Elizabeth's son by the Cypher Stories of Dr. W. Orville Owen (the word Cypher), followed by Mrs. Gallup (with the Biliteral Cypher), confirmed by historic research students like Parker Woodward, Mme. von Kunow, Granville Cunningham. As a youth he was sent by the Queen to the Continent and is there initiated into the Rites and Mysteries of the Knights Templar. He returned to England full of ideas to reform the world, having meanwhile fallen in love with Margaret of Navarre. He loses her. He presses the Queen to be recognised as her son. She cannot do so. He is under the cloud of bastardy. He begins to write down his emotions as an outlet—and so commences his Sonnet Diary. In every great crisis of his life he solaces himself in the sanctity of his private record—revealing himself to himself. He is forced to prosecute his brother the Earl of Essex. Down it goes. His Mother the Queen dies in agony. He embodies his emotion in the finest Sonnet in the English language. He climbs to the top, Regent of England, the Lord Chancellor. His enemies plot his downfall. He is accused of bribery. The King commands him to plead Guilty, fearful lest the Throne be imperilled. He is thrust into the Tower—his name a byword and reproach. All these tempestuous emotions, which swept his soul, are poured out between him and his Maker. How are they ever to be got into the world? Never in his day. They are too transparently intimate. They deal with Secrets of State. He leaves his Diary with the Heads of the Brotherhood he had created—"The Grand Possessors," which body Steevens actually mentions that you may know he was in the Succession. The author mixes up the Sonnets. He puts a NUMBER on the Title page, the date of entry at Stationers Hall. He arranges it shall be smuggled into the world in another age.

What proof have I of all this? That the Diarist is Francis Bacon? Purely academic proof quite apart from the fact that the Quarto reeks with Rosicross Signs and Masonic Signs.

Internal evidence shows that the Sonnet Diarist was an "attainted" man whose name had received a brand, a criminal conviction. That he had been

Impeached through a suborned Informer. That he was an **ADVOCATE**, i.e. a Lawyer who was on familiar terms with his **SOVEREIGN**. Now neither Shaksper of Stratford, nor De Vere, nor anyone else in that era, had been attainted, impeached, ruined through a suborned Informer, was an Advocate and was on familiar terms with his Sovereign. Shaksper could not have been Impeached any more than I could be. It could only apply to a Peer guilty of malfeasance in office. All these several points only apply to **FRANCIS BACON**, the Diarist who writes the story of his Fall in matchless imagery, and actually leaves behind his magic words complete explanations by concrete words and names woven through the lines in the most cunning manner by the virtual creator of the modern English tongue . . . Says he:—

"Every word doth almost **FELL** my name, showing their **THOUGHTS** and where they did proceed from and to . . . for **ALL MY BEST** is Dressing old words **NEW**."

But behind the Diary is the Heart Cry of a **MAN** . . . a **HUMAN BEING** **RACKED** with Agony because he was compelled to abandon his **DEFENCE** at the command of his King and plead guilty to Charges of Corruption. He closes every Theme with the smothered secret Cry, "**I AM INNOCENT! INNOCENT! I WAS NOT A CORRUPT JUDGE! I DID NOT ACCEPT BRIBES.**" And so he writes openly in his last Will . . . "And my name to my own Countrymen after some time be past." *That is the Secret of the Sonnets.* It is the Cry from across the Gulf of Centuries of England's greatest genius for Justice and Reinstatement in the hearts of his kinsmen for whom he did so much.

I therefore say—"Is it nothing to you all ye that pass by? Will you not help to establish his innocence to the world?" Believe me the problem is more than a literary one. It is preeminently a **MORAL QUESTION** and it is because I look at the entire controversy from this angle that I feel no trouble I undertake is too great to help to restore to one of the most lovable and virtuous of men, **HIS GOOD NAME**.

"Truth for ever on the Scaffold, Wrong for ever on the Throne, Yet that Scaffold sways the Future, and behind the dim Unknown, Standeth **GOD** within the Shadow, Keeping Watch above his own."

There is also evidence of another sort, which deals with the kind of paper used in the "1609 Quarto," the watermarks, the type-set, the manner of the printing, etc., all of which clinches the fact that the "1609 Quarto" was a private publication, was printed in 1625 and issued only to the Author's friends—his secret Disciples. I have a complete work of sixteen chapters in MS with numerous illustrations which will one day be published, in which the foregoing details are dealt with exhaustively. The complete evidence is overwhelming and irrefutable.

### A PLEA FOR UNITY.

To the Editor of **BACONIANA**

Sir,

In October **BACONIANA**, page 192, there is "A Plea for Unity." To the question, how can unity be achieved? Bacon seems to say—**By A Consideration Of Notes!** (that is of all parties) so here are two or three notes from the Shakespeare Sonnets for consideration: Sonnet 38, lines nine and ten:—

"Be thou the tenth muse, ten times more in worth  
Than those old nine, which rhymers invoke,"

(ten times 10 = 100 + 9 = 109).

The last two lines of Sonnet 109:—

"For nothing this wide universe I call  
Save thou my Rose, in it thou art my all."

Use every letter of those two lines once, and once only, and you get:—

"I Francis Verulam to his loving dualitie  
Henry Wriothesley Southampton."

This, I believe, can rightly be called "dressing old words new?" See Sonnet 76, 11th line.

Yours sincerely,

Sheringham.

R. M. EMERSON (MRS.)

## “THE WISEST FOOL”

The Cardinal Theatre Unit presented “The Wisest Fool” at the Torch Theatre, Knightsbridge, London, for a three-weeks’ run during November, 1946, advertising this production as “a play on the life of James I,” in which Mr. Francis Lister plays the part of the King. The author, J. Grant Anderson, therein demonstrates to what lengths a popularising play-maker will go in his endeavours to concoct what is styled an “historical” drama. There was scant justification for describing this particular effort as a “play” at all, since it amounted to nothing more than the stringing together of events and anecdotes readily available in any schoolroom textbook of history. It was not perceptible that the author had taken any pains to make the slightest independent research in the matters he had undertaken to present in dramatic form, whilst there was every sign that he intended to make the fullest use of dramatic licence.

Among the many characters—or, rather, caricatures—introduced in this astonishing farrago are two of peculiar interest: “Francis Bacon” and “William Shakespeare.” The former is depicted as a sycophant and careerist, harsh and relentless in his handling of Robert Kerr and Frances Howard in the Overbury case, and faithless in his later attitude towards Essex.

In Act One, Scene 2, Ben Jonson presents William Shakespeare to his Sovereign, but poor Will is so tongue-tied in the presence of majesty that he has to be assisted, in converse with the King, by no other than Mrs. Anne Shakespeare! The third scene of this Act, with its setting in the torture-chamber of the Tower, is simply naked melodrama.

It is almost incredible that compositions of this kind should take the stage, even in a little theatre—where, indeed, intelligent work is more frequently to be seen than amateurish nonsense—but this instance proves that there is still great need for enlightenment among the general theatre-going public if such pieces may be put forward as authentic re-creations of past events and not speedily rejected as falsifications due to ignorance or carelessness. One could only sympathise with the actors burdened with Mr. J. Grant Anderson’s extravagant conceptions of James I and the eminent personages of his time.

R. J. W. GENTRY.

---

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Sir,

### CIPHER SIGNATURE IN HENRY IV. (Part One)

To the information, given by Edward D. Johnson in BACONIANA, 1946, p. 191, about Cipher Signatures in 1 *Henry IV*, Act 2, scene 4, I may be allowed to subjoin the following. Add up the last five figures, five being the number of letters in the name *Bacon*. Their total is  $2 + 11 + 11 + 7 + 2 = 33$ , the number-value of that name. Add up the last nine figures. Their total,  $33 + 9 + 7 + 4 + 4 = 57$ , the number-value of *Fra. Bacon*, also the number of the Folio page on which this episode occurs. This same number is obtained by the addition of the first eight ( $2 + 4 + 4 + 2 + 4 + 4 = 24$ ) and the last five figures.

JAMES ARTHUR.



## BACON'S NUMBER CIPHER IN "LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST."

By JAMES ARTHUR.

ONE day, while absentmindedly fingering the leaves of *Love's Labour's Lost*, vaguely waiting for inspiration to find new clues for Bacon's authorship, I heard a ghostly whisper sounding in my ears. Short and cryptic, in just seven words, it said:—"Look for my name, age and title." There was no other thing to do but heed the warning voice. So I set out to read the Play for the *n*th time, starting from the very beginning. Nothing much happened till I was again struck, as had happened so many times before, by the words:—

"Things hid and barred, you mean, from common sense."

It is Berowne's interpretation of King Ferdinand's definition of "the end of study," namely:—

"That to know which else we should not know,"

reiterated by the first speaker a few lines further on, in the form:—

"To know the thing I am *forbid* to know."

Berowne is evidently Bacon's specific mouth-piece in this Play, who supplies that "common sense," so notably absent from the King's dreamy project:—

"Our court shall be a little academe,  
Still and contemplative in living art." (1).

But Berowne has also another function to perform in Bacon's scheme, that of hinting at his secrets, thereby arousing the wit and ingenuity of the would-be decipherer, to burrow them out. And when this time I noticed that the line by which my attention had first been drawn, was the 57th verse-line, remembering at the same time that 57 is the number-value of the name *Fra. Bacon*, I was certain to be on the right track. Nor was my expectation disappointed, for on closer scrutiny it was revealed that this one line, within the compass of 16 consecutive letters, carried every single one of the 8 letters of that abbreviated name:—

*Folio 122.*

Things hid & **bard** (you meane) fro comon sense.(2)

Returning to King Ferninand's opening speech, and re-reading it with more care, it seemed naturally to divide itself into three "stanzas" as it were, of 7, 7 and 9 lines each. Some modern editors

(1) That is, in the art of living.

(2) The 1598 Quarto has the misprint "hard" for "bard." If not necessary for Cipher purposes I follow the spelling of the Oxford Shakespeare in one volume by W. J. Craig.

in fact indicate them as such.<sup>(3)</sup> According to their subject-matter we shall call them the "Fame," the "Living-art" and the "Oath" stanza. And what I further found was that each of these stanzas contained the name *Francis Bacon*, in the well-known anagrammatic Cipher, fully described elsewhere.<sup>(4)</sup>

*Folio 122.*

*Fame*

'Let Fame that all hunt after in their lives,  
Live registred upon our brazen Tombes,  
And then grace us in the disgrace of death:  
When sight of cormorant devouring Time,  
Th'endeavour of this present breath may buy:  
That honour which shall bate his sythes keene edge,  
And make us heyres of all eternitie.

*Living-art*

Therefore brave Conquerours, for so you are,  
That warre against your owne affections,  
And the huge Armie of the worlds desires,  
Our late edict shall strongly stand in force,  
Navar shall be the wonder of the world.  
Our Court shall be a little Academe,  
Still and contemplative in living Art.

*Oath*

You three, Berowne, Dumaine, and Longavill,  
Have sworn for three yeeres terme, to live with me:  
My fellow Schollers, and to keepe those statutes  
That are recorded in this scedule heere.  
Your oathes are past, and now subscribe your names:  
That his owne hand may strike his honour downe,  
That violates the smallest branch heerein:  
If you are arm'd to doe, as sworne to do,  
Subscribe to your deepe oathes, and keepe it to."

In the old Quarto the anagram of the third stanza falls on different letters, because of the differences in spelling:—<sup>(5)</sup>

"You three, Berowne, Dumaine, and Longavill,  
Have sworne for three yeeres tearme, to live with me:  
My fellow Schollers, and to keepe those statues  
That are recorded in this sedule here  
Your othes are past, and now subscribe your names:  
That his owne hand may strike his honour downe,  
That violates the smallest branch herein.  
If you are armd to do, as sworne to do,  
Subscribe to your deepe othes, and keepe it to."

<sup>(3)</sup> See the Cambridge New Shakespeare, by Dover Wilson.

<sup>(4)</sup> See *A Royal Romance*, p. 267 ff.

<sup>(5)</sup> Even in modern spelling the acrostic is preserved.

These happy finds set me going in earnest. Reading on I came in due course to Berowne's peroration on books:—

"These earthly godfathers of heaven's lights  
That give a name to every fixed star."

Yet:—

"Small have continual plodders ever won,  
Save base authority from others' books."

These lines strongly remind us of the words of Bacon's first biographer, that "he was no plodder upon books," and as early as in his sixteenth year "fell into a dislike" of the "base authority won from others' books," especially those of Aristotle, then reigning undisputed in the Universities—"in which mind," Rawley concludes, "he continued to his dying day."<sup>(6)</sup> But what again struck me most forcibly were Berowne's last words still on this same Folio page:—

"Every godfather can give a name,"

meaning, every book can give a name, with the implication that it may not always be the right name. Well, here was *Love's Labour's Lost*, the first Play to bear the name *W. Shakespere* on the title page of the Quarto. Is it the right name? Or has Bacon been playing the "godfather?"<sup>(7)</sup> The question is already sufficiently answered by our discoveries on the first Folio page. These will however be further substantiated by those still to be revealed.

So far we have indeed found Bacon's name, as well as his number, at least *one* number. But what had puzzled me all the time was the injunction to look for his age. What age? I could supply no better answer than the age at which he wrote the Comedy. Consulting Chambers' *Shakespeare*, it was found that the date of composition fixed there for the Play, in the form in which it has come down to us, is 1594-95, when Bacon was 33 or 34 years old.<sup>(8)</sup> The first figure seemed of importance, as it is also the cabalistic value of the name *Bacon*. But how could it be made to spring forth from the text? Was there any "Figure" or "Cipher" to demonstrate it? Meanwhile my fingers were unconsciously running ahead of my reflections, and turning the next leaf, the eyes were arrested by the first two lines at the top of

*Folio 125.*

"A most fine Figure.  
To prove you a Cypher."

We are still in the first Act, it is in fact the last page of that Act. And the words made the impression of sealing off as it were, a Cipher

<sup>(6)</sup> Spedding, I, 4, 12.

<sup>(7)</sup> In print (1591) Sir John Harington referred to Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* as a work of authority by "an unknown godfather, but in a private note to the publisher, Field, he speaks of it as 'Putnams book.'" I hold that in this case also Bacon played the "godfather." See *Baconiana*, 1943, p. 191.

<sup>(8)</sup> *Loc. cit.*, I, 270. Dover Wilson gives the year 1593 for a supposed earlier version.



that had gone before. Quickly scanning the scene immediately preceding, it seemed indeed to offer an opening (I, 2, 38-60):—

*Armado.* I have promised to study three years with the duke.

*Moth.* You may do it in an hour, sir.

*Ar.* Impossible.

*Mo.* How many is one thrice told?

*Ar.* I am ill at reckoning; it fitteth the spirit of a tapster.

*Mo.* You are a gentleman and a gamester, sir.

*Ar.* I confess both; they are both the varnish of a complete man.

*Mo.* Then I am sure you know how much the gross sum of deuce-ace amounts to?

*Ar.* It doth amount to one more than two.

*Mo.* Which the base vulgar do call three.

*Ar.* True.

*Mo.* Why, sir, is this such a piece of study? Now here is three studied ere you'll thrice wink; and how easy it is to *put* 'years' to the word 'three,' and study three years in two words, the dancing horse will teach you.

*Ar.* A most fine figure.

*Mo.* To prove you a cipher.

Here apparently a way is indicated for obtaining Bacon's age at the time that he wrote *Love's Labour's Lost*, namely by putting *three* and *years* together *eleven times*. And a careful perusal of the text brings indeed to light the following eleven-fold reiteration of the combination up to the "Figure and Cipher" lines, nay up to the end of the Act:—

1. Have sworn for *three years'* term to live with me (I, 1, 16).
2. I am resolv'd; 'tis but a *three years* fast (24).
3. That is to live and study here *three years* (35).
4. And stay here in your court for *three years'* space (52).
5. And bide the penance of each *three years'* day (115).
6. Within the term of *three years* (129).
7. Three thousand times within this *three years'* space (149).
8. And so to study, *three years* is but short (179).
9. I have promised to study *three years* with the duke (2, 38).<sup>(9)</sup>
10. How easy it is to put *years* to the word *three* (56).
11. And study *three years* in two words (57).

The dancing horse alluded to by Moth, and acknowledged by Armado as a "fine Figure," was a well-known performing horse of the time, named Morocco, and first mentioned in 1591. A tract of 1596, called *Morocus Extaticus*, contains an illustration depicting the horse in a dancing posture, with two dice at his feet, one showing the ace, and the other the deuce. These numbers he was apparently taught to beat out with his hoof (Dover Wilson). But it appears

<sup>(9)</sup> The division into numbered scenes is a modern arrangement. The Quarto and Folio have only a division into Acts. In order to save space, and to press Armado's words (9) into one line, the Folio prints three in small Romans, thus—iii.

nowhere, as Moth suggests, that the horse taught an easy way to combine *three* with *years*, and no modern commentator has explained this curious assertion. It seems entirely a product of Bacon's own invention, thus enabling him to hint at the hidden "Cipher."

I was satisfied. Here were Bacon's "name and age" in one. And I reflected that, reaching this "span of life" he decided to write or rewrite the Comedy to celebrate that event, and make it at the same time a treasure-house of signs to prove his authorship. I will pass by those signs already known and explained by others, but will add three more number-plays I have discovered. The first runs along similar lines as the previous example. It revolves around the word "remuneration," which Costard suggests is Latin for "three farthings." It recalls the other utterance, that "Hang-hog is Latin for Bacon" (*Merry Wives*, IV, 1, 51). In reproducing the scene below, I have shortened it to save space, leaving out the irrelevant passages (III, 1, 138-183):—

*Arm.* (handing Costard a letter) Bear this significant to the country maid Jacquenetta. (Slipping a three-farthing coin into his palm) There is *remuneration* . . . (Exit Armado).

*Cost.* Now will I look to his *remuneration*. *Remuneration!* O! that's the Latin word for three farthings: three farthings, *remuneration* . . . I'll give you a *remuneration* . . . *Remuneration!* why, it is a fairer name than a French-Crown. (Enter Berowne) . . .

*Cost.* Pray you, sir, how much carnation ribbon may a man buy for a *remuneration*?

*Ber.* What is a *remuneration*?

*Cost.* Marry, sir, halfpenny farthing . . .

*Ber.* (handing him a letter to deliver, and a shilling) There's thy guerdon, go.

*Cost.* Gardon, O sweet gardon! better than *remuneration*; a 'leven-pence farthing better. Most sweet gardon! I will do it, sir, in print. Gardon! *remuneration!* (Exit Costard).

So far this scene yields only ten times remuneration. But there is a sequel to it, when Costard bestows upon Armado's page the self-same three-farthing coin he received from his master (V, 1, 77):—

*Cost.* (to Moth) Hold, there is the very *remuneration* I had of thy master, thou halfpenny purse of wit.<sup>(10)</sup>

If remuneration is three-farthings, then eleven times repeated, gives us again the number 33, and the name *Bacon*. And as in the former case the combination with years brought forth Bacon's age, so here the combination with farthings leads us to his title, as it affords Costard the opportunity to introduce the phrase, "a fairer name than a *French-Crown*." That fairer name is of course *Francis Rex*, French and Francis having the same root and meaning—frank, free, franchise, liberty, as suggested in the immediately preceding scene,

<sup>(10)</sup> This occurs on the same Folio page 136, where is found the longest Latin word, and "Ba with a horn added."

some twenty lines earlier (III. 1, 126-133). There is still another allusion contained in the combination, "French-Crown," and that is to the French disease, which produced a bald scalp, or an uncrowned head, denuded of its glory. Though Bacon might in the Biliteral Cipher occasionally style himself, "Francis Rex," he was only too painfully aware that he was but an Uncrowned King, and had to content himself with the sentiment laid upon the lips of the dethroned monarch—"My crown is in my heart, not on my head" (3 *Henry VI*, III, 1, 62).<sup>(11)</sup>

The other two number-plays occur in the last Act, where the five "Fantastics," Moth, Armado, Costard, Sir Nathaniel, and Holofernes, are going to perform the "Nine Worthies" before the Court of the King. The first scene is a dialogue between Berowne and Costard (V, 2, 485-510):—

Enter Costard.

*Ber.* Welcome, pure wit! thou partest a fair fray.

*Cost.* O lord, sir, they would know

3 Whether the *three* Worthies shall come in or no.

3 *Ber.* What, are there but *three*?

*Cost.* No, sir; but it is *vara* fine,

4 For every *one* pursents *three*.

18 *Ber.* And *three times thrice* is *nine*.

*Cost.* Not so, sir; under correction, sir, I hope, it is not so.

You cannot beg us, sir, I can assure you, sir; we know what we know;

9 I hope, sir, *three times thrice*, sir,—

9 *Ber.* Is not *nine*.

*Cost.* Under correction, sir, we know whereuntil it doth amount.

18 *Ber.* By Jove, I always took *three threes* for *nine*.

*Cost.* O Lord, sir! the parties themselves, the actors, sir, will show whereuntil it doth amount: for mine own part,

2 I am as they say, but to perfect *one* man in *one* poor man, Pom-pion the Great, sir.

1 *Ber.* Art thou *one* of the Worthies?

*Cost.* It pleased them to think me worthy of Pom-pion the Great: for mine own part, I know not the degree of the Worthy, but I am to stand for him.

*Ber.* Go, bid them prepare.

— *Cost.* We will turn it finely off, sir; we will take some care,

67 Exit Costard.

On the face of it, this is a senseless discussion, without rhyme or reason. It starts with Costard's request, whether the "three worthies" may enter. Nowhere is there any question of three, but only of

<sup>(11)</sup> I cannot here enter into full discussion of the symbolic force of the phrase "French Crown," and other similar ones. That will be the subject of another paper.



nine or five Worthies. Neither is it true that "every one" of the actors "presents three." These incongruities, not explained by any commentator, are evidently forced into the text by the necessities of the Cipher, which only so could produce the number 67 for the name *Francis*.

The second number-play, which is the sequel to the previous one, is even more senseless than the first. It is an altercation between the King and Berowne. The subject is still the "Nine Worthies." Armado has just left the stage, after informing the King of the coming of the Worthies. The King then announces (V, 2, 534-547):—

*King*. Here is like to be a good presence of Worthies. He (pointing at the retreating Armado) presents Hector of Troy; the swain, Pompey the Great; the parish curate, Alexander; Armado's page, Hercules; the pedant, Judas Maccabaeus:

4 And if these *four* Worthies in their first show thrive,

9 These *four* will change habits, and present the other *five*.

5 *Ber*. There is *five* in the first show.

*King*. You are deceived, 'tis not so.

*Ber*. The pedant, the braggart, the hedge-priest, the fool and the boy:—

9 Abate throw at *novum*, and the whole world again

6 Cannot pick out *five* such, take each *one* in his vein.

— *King*. The ship is under sail, and here she comes amain.

33

"Novum" is the vulgar, shortened name for a dice-game, *novem quinque*, wherein nine and five are the principal throws. Counting the numbers of the Worthies in this scene, we get the name *Bacon*, so that the two scenes together spell out the full name, *Francis Bacon*. Naturally we ask, How is it that the King, immediately after announcing "five" Worthies, speaks of them as being but "four," and gives the lie to Berowne who corrects his mistake, a correction moreover borne out by the sequel, when all five actors appear in their several roles? One commentator questioningly surmises that the King eliminates Hercules from the count, as not rightly belonging to the traditional "nine Worthies," but neither does Pompey belong to them, as he shows in an earlier note.<sup>(12)</sup> In truth, none of the non-Baconian interpreters is able or even tries to explain these absurdities reasonably. Dover Wilson writes: "None of the fantasies in this play can count even up to their fingers (?) . . . they cannot tell their own number when they get together (?). Armado cannot multiply one by three (he proves the contrary by his ready answer, "one more than two," when asked by Moth what deuce-ace amounts to). Costard cannot multiply three by three (yet he knows in a trice that a shilling is "elevenpence-farthing better" than a three-farthing bit). And we may add that even the King does not know the difference between four and five." Who believes all this?

(12) See the Arden Shakespeare.

The assumed inability to count is of course but the pretext for introducing the number-play. To take it seriously is making out the Playwright to be a fearful muddler, and the Play to be even worse than a "burlesque," a bedlam really. But Shakespeare has an apt word for every contingency of life (V, 2, 75):—

Folly in fools bears not so strong a note,

As foolery in the wise, when wit doth dote.

A last remark. Folio and Quarto head the King's opening speech conspicuously with the name, *Ferdinand*. Says Dover Wilson soberly: "As the name Ferdinand never appears in the dialogue, it lacks all dramatic point and is clearly therefore a mere relic of the (supposed) 1593 manuscript, to which we believe the whole of I, 1 belongs (?).<sup>(13)</sup> But Shakespeare in 1593 cannot have been ignorant that the name of the reigning king of Navarre was Henry. Why then did he call the king in his play Ferdinand, a name which no king of Navarre had ever borne?" I hazard the tentative suggestion that in this name Bacon saw a synonym of his own "Christian name," *Francis*, deriving it probably from the same root as frank, free, freed, and meaning therefore the Deliverer, or the Liberator. Modern etymology seems better instructed, deriving it from the Anglo-Saxon *here* (host), and *nand jan* (to dare), the two together meaning "brave in the host."

## LECTURES AT THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, LONDON

Two lectures were given this autumn by Miss Sennett to a Lodge of the Theosophical Society, at 50, Gloucester Place, W.1.

The first, on 7th October, under the title, "Francis Bacon, The Man and his Work", dealt briefly with the events of Bacon's life,—the royal birth, travel in France, Spain and Italy, his retired and private life, and his labours in writing the great plays in the Name of Shake-speare and in other names, the injustice of the accusations brought against him which caused his fall from office, and the probability that he did not die in the year 1626, but went secretly into Europe, and lived there for many years.

The second lecture, on the 18th November, had for title, "The Wisdom of Shake-speare", and was on the psychological interpretive method of seeking the Wisdom-Teaching in the Plays. "Twelfth Night", and "As You Like It" were interpreted in outline and reference was made to Miss Mary Kavanagh's work on "Macbeth", and showed that these methods are linked with Bacon's method of interpretation in "The Wisdom of the Ancients", and the great value of the Author's Introduction to that work, which is an Essay on the interpretation of symbolism.

Questions and discussion followed both meetings.

(13) I believe the contrary—that, if there has been an earlier version, "the whole of I, 1" belongs rather to the later revision.

## THE "ABC" OF A BACON CONCORDANCE.

By ARTHUR CONSTANCE.

**I** MAKE no apology for pausing in what Mr. James Arther, in his article *A Bacon Concordance is Possible*, in your October issue, describes as my "retreat from the field," to survey the scene so efficiently mapped by Mr. Arther, and—with grateful appreciation of his generosity and interest—to adjust one or two of his boundary lines, and enable your readers to get an even clearer "bird's-eye view" of the position than that given in his admirable article.

None of us should mind criticism. Our cause, as Baconians, is of vital significance to this generation. It is not merely a matter of reinstating Bacon in his rightful position, so that the world of letters may give him the immortal credit for that wider authorship which is his just due: this world of fears, doubts and compromises is in the mess and muddle it is because English-speaking people have so widely departed from the high standards which were the inspiration and corrective guide of Francis Bacon's life; and his enthronement as the monarch of learning might well do much to direct the attention of erring humans to those standards.

I have lost no whit of my passionate belief in a Bacon Concordance as the royal road to the reinstatement of Bacon upon that throne of letters, and I beg my critics and readers to bear this fact in mind as they read this article. For I cannot believe that this is a time for weak platitudes or mutual back-scratching. This is an age of crisis, in which all human values are in the melting-pot, and we shall get nowhere (unless deeper and deeper into the witches' brew) unless we tackle our problems in that spirit of firmness and enthusiastic courage which inspired Bacon himself.

I will say at once, therefore, that I cannot agree with Mr. Arther's classification, or Table, in which he lays down a scheme for the production of three or four separate Concordances. I think this scheme—with all respect and appreciation of Mr. Arther's kindness, zeal and application to the matter—would dissipate energy which urgently needs to be concentrated efficiently, and with a minimum of waste effort, if the Concordance is to be a practical success. I say emphatically that there should be one Concordance, but that it should be published in two volumes; the first to include all the English Works and Letters, together with English translations of the Latin Works, and the latter to comprise the Latin works, in Latin. If a preliminary survey should show that the first volume would be too bulky (and at the moment I do not agree, despite the fact that I obviously lay myself wide open to criticism from any "calculation of words" viewpoint—which is *not* necessarily a safe and sound view-



point; then the first volume itself could be produced in two parts. But I now stress the very important fact that *the whole* of Bacon's English works *must* be tackled from the outset as one solid whole, and not split up—otherwise it would obviously mean going over the same analytical fields again and again.

I agree with much that Mr. Arther says, and particularly appreciate his detailed knowledge of the subject. But I respectfully stress the fact that there is more in all this than meets the eye—as the victims of any thimble-rigger at a fair learn by bitter experience. And in this case we must run no risk of paying dearly for experience—we must be sure that our resources are adequate, use them efficiently from the outset, and realise also, while discussing these preliminary facts, that the thimbles are monstrous, and that there will probably be more than a million peas (index-cards) for classification and reclassification and preparation for the printer, and that to fancy that they should be under this particular thimble when they should, by all the laws of concordance jiggery-pokery, be under another, would inevitably mean a loss of money and a yokel-like “Now, how on earth did *that* happen?” a little later on.

I have indicated, what is the exact truth, that I have a collection of concordances which is practically unique—it may be that certain members of the American Concordance Society have as many, but I cannot believe that anyone on earth has more. I have an unique reference library, and I shall say with no false modesty that I am confident I could carry the task through. But juggling with a few hundred thousand words is no child's play, and there are (as Mr. Arther shrewdly suspects) nearly a million in Shakespeare's Works (*pace* Bartlett, Mrs. Cowden Clarke and the rest of the nearly-blinded pioneers in that field) and probably more than this total in Bacon's *other* works. My eyesight is good, although I have used it more than the average bookworm. I am not afraid of the task, for I should have helpers—although it should be realised that it might be symbolised as—not looking for a needle in a haystack, but—taking three or four haystacks, breaking them down into wisps of hay, arranging the wisps in order of length, shade of hay-colour, thickness, and blowing the dust out of the holes through them, and then stacking them into more orderly haystacks again. One must naturally expect to get a little cramped, overtired and dusty in the process, which would, as watchmakers tell us when we ask how long a repair is going to be in these post-war conditions, “take the best part of some time.” I imagine two or three years, if efficiently tackled from the outset.

And I see that word “efficiently” as meaning efficiently, and not a near-beer, shadowy, half-and-half something else.

I should have to go through the alphabet more than once (I seem to hear weird and ghostly laughter from the resting places of the Lexicon Legionaries who have passed from this world) before the Concordance went to the printers; even though it went page by page, for I should have to know my A.B.C. fairly well to tackle the first

paragraph of the first work selected. But I suggest that we, as Baconians, must know the first three letters of the alphabet, and what they signify in this matter, before a single index-card is indexed. And these first three letters surely represent: Adequate Bank Coverage. Cold, unpleasant-looking words—like icy drops trickling from a nearly-frozen tap, when one contemplates (heroically) a cold bath on a winter's morning. But we would do well to take any cold douches in this matter before the index-cards start stacking up.

So I will say firmly, even though my kind correspondents throw in their towels and get back into bed again (and too many of us Baconians are snoring at this late hour when we ought to be up and doing) that we have to begin at the beginning and make sure of *that* A.B.C. before we go on to the Doing of the concordance, and all the Examining, Figuring, Glossing, etc., lying beyond, until the end is reached and the Baconian student is (almost literally) given, in the shape of the completed concordance, a new Y Z on his shoulders.

If there are not sufficient Baconians, however, among your readers, to follow Mr. Arther's fine example, in the generous spirit of Bacon himself (for he was never the *meanest* of his circle when called on to help the Advancement of Learning) then I am afraid I shall not retrace my steps in my "retreat," but shall look back on the scene, shading my eyes as the sun of human enlightenment slowly sinks to the horizon, and shall wave a regretful farewell to those who have come with me thus far, as I leave the project behind me, thinking those words which have been described as the saddest of tongue or pen: "It might have been."

---

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Sir,

"TIMON OF ATHENS".

Sir Sidney Lee in his "Life of William Shakespeare" wrote "although Shakespeare's powers showed no signs of exhaustion, he reverted in the year following the colossal effort of *Lear* (1607) to his earlier habit of collaboration and with another's aid composed two dramas, "Timon of Athens" and "Pericles." There is no authority anywhere for this statement. There is no evidence for the date 1607 that he mentions and his theory of collaboration is simply conjecture. Lee wishes to show that "Timon of Athens" was written in Shakspeare's lifetime prior to 1616 when he died, so he calmly invents this date to support the theory that Shakespeare wrote this play. This example is typical of Lee's unscrupulous method of using his own imagination to make history. This terrible tragedy of Timon according to Lee was written by a man who was living in retired prosperity at Stratford and who had never gone through the experiences recorded in the play. On the other hand this play exactly expresses Bacon's state of mind at the time of his fall from power and records his recklessness in money matters—the way in which he spoiled his retainers, their leaving him like rats leaving a ship when he was disgraced and the fidelity of his steward (Sir Thomas Meautys).

Yours faithfully,  
EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

## “SHAKESPEARE” AND THE ITALIAN COMEDY.

By R. J. W. GENTRY.

**I**N evidence of the fact that Francis Bacon visited Italy in his youth, we have the categorical statement that he did so in a French book of 1631, by Pierre Amboise, entitled: “A DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE OF FRANCIS BACON, CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND.” A copy of this work, important as the first biography of Bacon, is in the British Museum, and experts have found no reason to doubt the authenticity of the information supplied by its author.

About 1580, Francis himself wrote most discerningly of the conditions in Italy under its princes in a tract: “OF THE STATE OF EUROPE.” “Such a great extent and minuteness of information for so young a man as Bacon was at this time” (Craik) argues the probability of his personal observation and local inquiry concerning the matters he reports.

Again, in 1618, Bacon’s *ESSAYS* were rendered into Italian by his friend, Sir Tobie Matthew, who dedicated his translation to the then Grand Duke of Tuscany, as though to an honoured acquaintance of Bacon himself.

The “Shakespearean” Plays, too, show such intimate knowledge of Italian topography and social customs that it is extremely difficult not to conclude that their author had had an immediate familiarity with the country and its people in his earlier life.

No research has yet been able to establish that Shakspeare of Stratford ever left his native soil, but many facts point to the likelihood of Francis Bacon’s having drawn upon personal experience of Italy and Italians for material of dramatic value in his writing of the Plays.

It may be interesting to inquire if Bacon, as a brilliant young man of letters, imbued with a deep regard for the stage, ever came into contact with, and was influenced by, the famous *Commedia dell’Arte* while he was visiting the land of its origin.

The *Commedia* of the Renaissance was a type of theatre quite different from any other. As distinct from the written comedies, it was performed, and could only be performed, by professional actors. In sixteenth century Italy it co-existed with the legitimate theatre, with which it vied very successfully for popular support, being similar in this respect to the *Atellanae* or pantomimes in which it had its ancestry, and which eventually ousted the classic theatre from the favour of the ancient Roman populace. The *Commedia* and *Atellanae* alike were improvised from scenarios, and the dialogue was made up by the actors as the play went along. Their only guidance was the plot-outline which was posted up in the wings, and which was con-



sulted by the players at the beginning of each scene. They "suited the action to the word, and the word to the action" as the occasion demanded, and needed to exercise a high degree of extemporizing skill, fluency, humour and adaptability. It is easy to see why only professionals could take part in this kind of theatre. Maurice Sand describes the *Commedia*, in his "*MASQUES ET BOUFFONS*," as "the perfection of plays."

Then, again, the roles were stylized. Bologna, with its ancient University, contributed the Doctor, who was as foolish as he was pedantic; Venice, the city of merchants and adventurers, evolved Pantaloon and the Captain; the upper and lower Bergamos—districts of Italy notorious for the supposedly abnormal proportion of dullards in their populations—produced the sly, but sometimes witty, booby Harlequin, and the knave Brighella. Pulcinella, another character, with his hooked nose, hump, fleshy cheeks and outsized mouth, became familiar in England, from the end of the seventeenth century, as Punch.

It is known that Francis Bacon was in Poitiers in 1577, and it is likely that he went on to Italy about this time, since travel, especially to that country, was considered as an essential in the education of young noblemen. Cities like Rome, Venice, Bologna, Florence, Pisa, Verona, Padua were the dream-places of poets and students, and had to be savoured by personal sojourn in them. In his *Essay*, "*OF BUILDING*," he says: "For it is strange to see, now in Europe, such high buildings as the Vatican and Escorial and others be, and yet scarce a very fair room in them"; and in "*OF FACTION*": "The even carriage between the two factions proceedeth not always of moderation, but of a trueness to a man's self, with end to make use of both. Certainly, in Italy, they hold it a little suspect in popes, when they have often in their mouth, *Padre commune*; and take it to be a sign of one that meaneth to refer all to the greatness of his own house."

About this time (1577) was published a book known as the *RECUEIL FOSSARD*, or, to give its full title: "*Recueil de plusieurs fragments de premières comédies italiennes qui ont esté représentées en France sous le règne Henry III.*" A lover of the stage and man of letters such as Francis Bacon would hardly have failed to come across this work, and the account given therein must have aroused a desire to witness in action the characters depicted in the book. The reproduction by Duchartre and Van Buggenhoudt of Paris (1928) shows the excellence of the engraved illustrations in the original, which clearly indicate a highly developed art in the *Commedia dell'Arte*. The well-defined characters of Harlequin, Pantaloon, the Captain, Brighella, the Doctor, Pulcinella, etc., are such as would inspire the young literary genius with many ideas for the portraying of personalities calculated to amuse, awe and instruct in the greater plays later to come from his hand.

While Francis was attending the French Court, there would have been an opportunity for him to see performances especially put on for

the King, who was very partial to this type of entertainment. Henry had invited a celebrated troupe—the Gelosi—to come to Blois for the opening of the Etats, which was to take place on the 15th November, 1576. The Etats did not begin their sessions until the 6th December, and L'Estoile recorded that, in February, "the Italian comedies, called the Gelosi, whom the King had invited to come from Venice, paying their ransoms after they had been captured by the Huguenots, began to perform their comedies at the Salle des Etats at Blois, and the King permitted them to ask a half-testoon from all who should come to see them play." He adds that the Gelosi were playing at the Hotel de Bourbon in Paris in the following September. The director of this famous troupe was Flaminio Scala, who belonged to the nobility and was a man of extensive culture. Under him, it achieved the highest degree of unity of all the troupes of the Commedia dell' Arte, and he defined the characters more sharply than any previous interpreter had done, giving them style and consistency and instilling more order in the improvisation of dialogue and stage business. Besides being a versatile actor, he left a collection of fifty scenarios, which were printed in 1611. Here was a man of the widest experience in acting, who would have been found a most congenial acquaintance by a youth anxious to imbibe all the practical wisdom of the stage that came his way.

In 1578 the Gelosi went to Florence; in the following year, they returned to Venice to attend the Carnival; later they proceeded to Mantua, and in July, to Genoa. They were in Milan in 1580, and came back to Venice for the Carnival in 1581. If Francis Bacon made a tour of the north Italian cities during these years, he would have been able to see the Gelosi again and again in their native setting and so derive much firsthand knowledge of their skilful technique and memorable characterisation.

The Commedia dell' Arte differed from the classical theatre in comprising within itself, as it developed, both comedy and tragedy, which the older drama kept quite apart. George Sand described it as having an "uninterrupted tradition of fantastic humour which is in essence quite serious and, one might say, even sad, like every satire which lays bare the spiritual poverty of mankind." R. G. Moulton says that the terms Comedy and Tragedy are inadequate and, indeed, absurd when applied to Shakespeare. The distinction these terms express is one of Tones, and they were quite in place in the Ancient Drama, in which the comic and tragic tones were kept rigidly distinct and were not allowed to mingle in the same play. Applied to a branch of Drama of which the leading characteristic is the complete mixture of Tones, the terms necessarily break down, and the so-called 'Comedies' of *The Merchant of Venice* and *Measure for Measure* contain some of the most tragic effects in Shakespeare." He goes on to maintain that the true distinction between the two kinds of play is one of Movement, not Tone. Comedy and Tragedy would be better described by the terms Action-Drama and Passion-

Drama respectively. In the *Commedia dell' Arte*, we discover an amalgam of these two types of drama, as we do in Shakespeare.

With regard to Shakespeare's dramatic characterisation, it is possible to perceive, in the various figures of the *Commedia*, some foreshadowing of the more conspicuous of our great playwright's *dramatis personae*. Pantaloon, for example, seems to have much affinity with Polonius. In his *Histoire du théâtre italienne* (1728) Riccobini writes of Pantaloon, who had the habit of meddling in the affairs of State, that he was a "respectable head of the family, extremely particular about his word of honour, and a strict disciplinarian of his children." He had an harangue ever on the tip of his tongue, as when advising his son or counselling princes and potentates. He drew laughter at the fitting moment and shows forth as a man matured in years, who pretends to be a tower of strength and good counsel for others, whereas in truth he is an old dotard constantly blundering and making a mess of everything. He is often duped and his daughter is a source of continued anxiety to him. Shakespeare was certainly acquainted with him as a character, for in *As You Like It* he refers to "the lean and slippered pantaloon." Recollection of various depictions he may have witnessed might well have afforded him inspiration for the picture he draws of the "foolish, prating" Polonius.

Of somewhat similar constitution to Pantaloon, but evincing a spurious and ostentatious learning as his peculiar trait is the Doctor. Despite his display of pedantic book-learning and all-to-ready eloquence, he cannot recite a classical quotation without garbling it. He has been termed an "eternal gas-bag who cannot open his mouth without spitting out a Latin phrase or quotation." Is it admissible to see in this personage the prototype of Holofernes, of *Love's Labour's Lost*?

Then we have the villain of the *Commedia dell' Arte*—Brighella, the slippery rogue who sets out to enrich himself by cozening some unsuspecting gullible stranger. He revels in intrigues and quarrels, especially if he can personally benefit by arranging and instigating them. He does not boggle at a knife-thrust to procure money to squander in evil pleasures. He is an expert at cajoling, and uses persuasive rhetoric to lead victims into paths of disaster. His lineaments perfectly fit such a counterpart as Shakespeare has given us in Iago.

Another important member of the band is the Captain, a swash-buckling cavalier with bristling moustache, huge nose, and enormous sword that is constantly vibrating with the rage of its fire-eating wielder. He is arrayed in a splendid uniform, decorated with many trophies alleged to be taken from the foes he has vanquished. In spite of his protest that he prefers Mars to Venus, he is a dire slayer of hearts, and vaunts his conquests of noble ladies by the dozen. But for all his bombast and bragging, he is very soon deflated by the mere sight of Harlequin with his slap-stick. There is a verse about one of these valiant heroes of the seventeenth century:



Ce Capitain fait grand esclat,  
 Et sa valeur est si parfaite  
 Qu'il est des derniers au combat,  
 Et des premiers a la retraite.

Gaultier-Garguille describes the Captains of his day in *Opusculé Tabarinique*: "Their dreadful swords have filled the cemeteries to overflowing; but somehow all their victims seem to be still alive and well. But the worst of all is that even Jupiter himself trembles at one squinting glance from beneath their shaking plumes. He is evidently only too ready to surrender his eagle and thunderbolts to be at peace with them—albeit the only victories they ever win are over the poor snails and flies and frogs." This prowess seems to match the antics of Sir John Falstaff when, for instance, he counterfeits death to avoid the blows of Douglas, averring the better part of valour to be "discretion," and fleshes his sword in the thigh of the dead Hotspur. His declaration to Brook, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, to the effect that he feared not Goliath is hardly borne out by his practice! And his aim to cut a fine figure before the ladies is also reminiscent of the Captain's amatory ambitions on the Commedia stage. During the period of the Spanish ascendancy in Italy, the Spanish conception of the character came to displace the Italian, and the Captain dressed and spoke as a Castilian. His innate craven nature showed less frequently, although he retained all his absurd airs and graces. Perhaps the adjective 'Castilian' holds something of its original Commedia associations when used as an expression of contempt in *The Merry Wives* and *Twelfth Night*.

Incidentally, another word used by Shakespeare is 'Zany' (*Love's Labour's Lost*) and its plural (*Twelfth Night*). This word was the name of a character in the Commedia, a buffoon of wily disposition, according to the evidence of the *Recueil Fossard*. In time, it came to denote a genre of role.

Again, it is possible to discern, in Harlequin—the most individualized member of the Commedia—something of Touchstone, Lear's Fool, and the First Clown in *Hamlet*. Originating from Bergamo, Harlequin nevertheless lets fall some shrewd flashes of wit, which were the delight of the audiences; such droll whimsicalities as he purveyed contained much satirical wisdom. In 1601, an unusual treatise was published in Lyons, entitled: *Compositions de Rhétorique de M. don Arlequin*. It is an amusing work and gives ample proof that much pointed and extravagant humour abounded in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Besides being the possible source of a number of simple dramatic characterisations to be elaborated into the fully drawn human portraits later given to the world by Shakespeare, the Commedia dell'Arte was an influence also in the sphere of practical stagecraft that must have made its due impact upon the mind of the Author of the Plays. It is said that the Italian method of declamation did much to cure what Moliere called "the demoniacal tone" in the French

players, some of whom actually sustained apoplexy on the stage itself as an unfortunate result of it! Hamlet's speech to the players seems to give such advice as would indicate that Shakespeare himself had taken to heart the same lessons of disciplined natural acting and smooth delivery of lines demonstrated in the practice of the Italian actors.

As the troupes travelled widely, they took the *Commedia* into every country of Europe and gained an international reputation. In 1527 a company under Drusiano Martinelli played in England, and it may be argued that Shakespeare was able subsequently to see a performance of the Italians without going beyond the confines of his native land. But it is doubtful whether such very occasional shows would have sufficiently imbued the Englishman with such a knowledge of their characters and methods as he seems to have possessed. A stay in Italy of some years, and a prolonged study of their technique would have done so, but it is Francis Bacon that had the opportunity for such a study, not Shakspeare of Stratford.

---

To the Editor of *BACONIANA*

Dear Sir,

#### BACON'S CIPHER NUMBERS IN HENRY V.

I beg to acquaint you with a small but significant discovery in the 1623 Folio. It may be of interest to your readers.

On page 78 of the *Histories* (true page 110—Henry V) occurs a character whose name is spelled MAKMORRICE twice in col. 1 (lines 54 and 60 down), and MACKMORRICE 5 times in col. 2 (lines 7, 15, 40, 47, and 58 down). He is not mentioned anywhere else but on this page.

The extra 'C' is important and occurs frequently in the Folio (e.g., words like warlicke, rancke, eccho, etc.) C = 100 = Francis Bacon in Simple Cipher—the man "whose silent name one letter bounds." There are 29 Capital C's on this page.

Nor is this all. In Simple Cypher Makmorrice counts up to 100 (= Francis Bacon) and Mackmorrice to 103 (= Shakespeare).

A more subtle way of indicating the identity of 2 persons can hardly be imagined.

The number affiliations are also interesting. Taking the 7 references in order of appearance as (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g):—

(c) is on 57th line up the column (57 = Fran. Bacon).

There are 57 lines inclusive between (a) and (f).

(g) is on the 67th line from (a) (67 = Francis).

(e) is on the 33rd line from (c) (33 = Bacon)

(g) is 88th word from (f) (88 = Fr. St. Alban).

After (a) to end of page there are 74 words altogether (74 = William)

Makmorrice (100) thus has a Shakespeare affiliation, and Mackmorrice (= 103) has Bacon affiliations.

Bath, Somerset,

Yours faithfully,

F. V. MATARALY.

## WHAT MEANEST THOU BY THESE?

A Few Comments on Pope's Usages of the  
Word "Meanest."

By ARTHUR CONSTANCE.

**I** MUST ask the courtesy of your columns to reply to James Arther's "few words of warning regarding the use of Concordances," in which he rightly says that "the possession of a Concordance does not relieve one of the duty to study the works concerned"—although I have yet to meet anyone who has ever suggested such a thing—and goes on to deal with the six quotations from Pope which I cited in my earlier article, with the avowed intention of showing that Pope malevolently and viciously intended an attack on Bacon in the famous *Essay on Man* passage, and in fact never used the word "meanest" to mean humblest.

Now this is flying in the face of all the facts, and I can only recommend Mr. Arther to take his own advice and give a little more study to the contexts of the passages in question. But he should first examine his O.E.D. with a view to realising the true significances of the word "humblest"—even a cursory glance into the O.E.D. will show him the full meaning of the word, and make him pause before he limits it to any narrow definition to suit his case.

But we do not need to broaden the usual definition of humblest—the passages from Pope do not bear the strained interpretations which Mr. Arther forces from them. Let us take them one at a time:

"Nor pass the meanest unregarded." (*Dunciad*, iv, 575). I am amazed that Mr. Arther should interpret the word "meanest" in any other sense than "humblest." Pope obviously intended a contrast with "contending princes," "the queen," "titles and degrees," etc., in the preceding lines. The context of this usage of "meanest" points to "humblest" as its only possible interpretation as assuredly as all the signposts around London which have the name of the capital on them point towards that metropolis. Or course, Mr. Arther may declare that they also point away from the capital if he likes, but he will be making a choice as arbitrary and individualistic as the inhabitant of a remote village in the wilds of Scotland. What any such interpretation of this usage of "meanest" as "most foolish, dull, mute," has to do with what Pope intended, Mr. Arther must himself explain, for any such definition is entirely his own. I think that "mute" as a definition of "meanest" (especially) not only takes the cake but is the most unkindest cut of all!

"Or deeming meanest what we greatest call" (*Epistle to Harley*, 19). Mr. Arther says, "Here the context teaches us little"—a sentence which indicates his own position regarding the Pope contexts:



but the personal pronoun should surely be singular. For he actually says that the context in this case "does not warrant us to give (sic) the word a deeper meaning than that of an antonym to greatest, that is 'smallest, lowest'"—as though the words he has himself selected can be used, in this connection, to mean anything but "humblest": It is of course obvious that the *immediate* context of this usage—the words in the actual line itself—indicate a contrast between meanest and greatest (suggesting *humblest* at once) while the words "careless now of interest, fame, or fate," which are in close juxtaposition, serve to emphasise this sole interpretation.

I come to the next passage utterly bewildered and at a loss to understand how Mr. Arther can possibly have applied such arbitrary definitions as "weakest, tremblingest (!), most laggard, vainest" to Pope's usage of "meanest" in the line: "The last, the meanest of your sons inspire" (*Essay—not Essays—on Criticism*, 196). "*Vainest*"!!! Oh, Mr. Arther, this is stretching definition so far that it snaps back, hits one between the eyes, and leaves one stunned and stupefied! So with any suggestion that "most cowardly" is implied in the word "meanest" as it occurs in "He dreads a death-bed like the meanest slave" (Ep. i)—where the poet's plain intention is not to tax ordinary mortals with cowardice, but to stress that HE is "most cowardly." Look at this passage again, Mr. Arther, and you will surely appreciate the fact that the word meanest is only applied as a description of "slave," clearly suggesting common humanity or humility in no disparaging sense. It is not directly opposed to "he." We might paraphrase the idea as "He, proud as he is, fears death like any slave, however humble"—the word "meanest" being thus associated, NOT with "dreads" (as Mr. Arther suggests) but with the implication that "*he*" is *proud*, with which it is contrasted. So the suggestion that "meanest" here means "most cowardly" has no justification. "And what is Fame? the Meanest have their day." (*Sat. iv.*) Mr. Arther again says "there is little to learn from the context," so that one begins to suspect that he has a convenient "blind spot" in his critical vision—for the whole of the context, from "Go then—" (line 29) to "Tully or than Hyde!" (line 56) illustrates the truth of the line under discussion, in which the words "the meanest have their day" can mean nothing if they do not mean "the humblest have their day." In fact Mr. Arther himself says, "the meanest are those as yet 'destitute of Fame, obscure, unknown'"—and if these words of Mr. Arther's do not mean "humblest," and that in no offensive or derogatory sense, then I will solemnly shred my trilby into fragments and consume it piece by piece, washing it down with draughts of penitential tears.

Mr Arther then comes to the *pièce de résistance* of his unsatisfying critical spread—that line of Pope's which has caused all the smother and pother, although its meaning should have been as clear as daylight to the meanest of mankind—and should never have necessitated Mr. Kendra Baker's overwhelmingly-convincing treatise. For the line,

as applied to Bacon, "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind" (*Essay on Man*, iv, 282) occurs in a passage which is not designed as an attack on Bacon in any vitriolic sense. Pope had the tongue of a viper when he chose, but it was curled in his cheek on this occasion, and he was behaving like no apoplectic Stratfordian, "like a maniac scattering flame," but commenting, ironically yet sadly, on the insecurity of worldly reputation. "To sigh for ribands if thou art so silly," he himself sighs, a line or so before; and a few lines before that: "These blessings . . . see to what they mount"—and again, "Say, would'st thou be the man to whom they fall?" There is thus no note of venom in the passage—it has an undertone of sadness, of pity for mankind, in the spirit of Gray's "The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

Why on earth should Pope want to insert an utterly inconsistent attack on Bacon in such a passage—any such reference to Bacon would have been incongruous; alien to the spirit of the passage. Context, Mr. Arther, context! The very next line to the one we are discussing shows that the word "meanest" was intended in a compassionate sense, and one indicative of the poet's universal and almost godlike view of humanity's folly in pursuing the "ribands" and the "yellow dirt" of earthly glory, for it reads: "Or ravished with the whistling of a name."

It should now surely be settled, once and for all time, that this line of Pope's—seized upon so often by Stratfordians as drowning men clutch at straws—is in fact no more than a straw when anyone tries to thrash Bacon with it. It breaks in the hand, and I can imagine that Bacon himself, had he (by some magical means) possessed a copy of Pope's *Essay on Man*, and had some double-minded acquaintance ventured to point a dirty finger at the line, with the suggestion that Pope had meant it as an attack on him—that Bacon himself (conceding timelessness in the conception) would have quoted Pope's line, with a jerk of his thumb towards the mean-minded one:

"Behold the child, by nature's kindly law,

"Pleased with a rattle, tickled with a straw!"

## BOOK REVIEWS.

### WAS SHAKESPEARE EDUCATED? (1)

**M**R. WILFRID GUNDRY, who combines much scholarship with style, has placed Baconians under a considerable debt in his latest book, "Was Shakespeare Educated?" It forms the crux to the Shakespearean Plays. It transcends in a way what is really the larger subject, namely the whole philosophy and learning contained in the dramatic plays known to the world as Shakespeare's. Mr Gundry contends, as do Baconians, that they were really a part of Bacon's acknowledged *Instauratio Magna*. It transcends all else in the sense that Bacon's object was to educate the world to greater heights and that if we can identify the genius behind the mask, his learning and scholarship are vital to the elucidation of the mystery.

This has been as plain as a pikestaff to me and doubtless others since my schoolboy days. Having struggled through many years of instruction in the classics, picking up some knowledge of Homer and Sophocles, or of Virgil and Ovid, I realised well when a literary uncle said to me before my last term or so, "My boy, you are now in the sixth form, and presumably you are going on to Cambridge. Have they taught you Shakespeare?" I replied a little haughtily, yes, when I was in a lower form. He replied, "Quite so—that is what I expected you to say. But one day you will realise that the man who wrote under the name of Shakespeare was apart from genius a great classic scholar and that means learning the classics doesn't it?" "Of course" I replied. "If Shakespeare knew all the classic writers intimately, he could not have mastered them by intuition alone could he?" "No, Uncle," I answered, "He must have swotted them up as I had to." He told me that Shakespeare was the most learned man of his age, and asked me if I could believe a rustic, unschooled, could know the classics by instinct. I said "No, of course he couldn't." "Of course," he agreed, "and one day you will discover like me that the genius was Francis Bacon." I have never forgotten that discussion.

To genius may be attributed many things but not sheer learning. This gets to the rock-bottom so far as Bacon versus Shaksper are concerned. It rules out "our Will" and reduces Stratford-on-Avon to its true proportions as merely the town which could claim as a citizen an illiterate butcher-boy who became a more or less well-known mummer in London and ended his days as a prosperous tradesman and money-lender. That is in brief what Mr. Gundry is preaching. "It is the contention of Baconians," he says, "that the plays of Shakespeare are a part of Bacon's *Instauratio Magna*," How true! Anyone who has read the Bacon Ciphers will realise that from the instant when Francis was made aware of his illustrious birth and was despatched hurriedly, it might almost be said in a panic, to the Court of France in order to get him away from influences at home, he determined to try to educate the English as the Pleiade were doing in France, except that he used the stage as an important vehicle of instruction. It is altogether false to believe, as many do, that there was a general renaissance of learning in Elizabeth's reign. Those who were highly educated and capable of teaching the rabble were few and far between. The man who lived in debt in order to be able to produce books which were a part of his Great Instauration and used the theatre as a medium of instruction, was the one consummate and outstanding genius, a man born once in perhaps a myriad years.

The education and erudition of "Shakespeare" is thus Mr. Gundry's theme. He gives the pros and cons with fairness; those who have acclaimed Shaksper as an ill-educated man and yet who instinctively knew all things by some stupendous and godlike force which they term genius, and those who ridicule the entire claim like the statesman John Bright, who said bluntly, "Any man who believes that William Shaksper of Stratford wrote *Hamlet* or *Lear* is a fool." Bright put the whole case against the mere word genius in a nutshell. In this book Mr. Gundry has collated all that can be garnered on the subject of the educational

(1) *Was Shakespeare Educated?* By W. G. C. Gundry; published by Lapworth & Co., Ltd., Vernon House, Sicilian Avenue, London, W.C.1. Price 2s. 6d. net.



aspect as conveyed in the Plays, has produced his evidence with painstaking and care, and offers to the Stratfordians a challenge which they cannot face and studiously ignore. He has produced a valuable addition to the Baconian literature and his attractive little book, with its numerous illustrations, should obtain a wide sale. A.W.

### THE MYSTERY OF THE FIRST FOLIO. <sup>(1)</sup>

A NEW EDWARD JOHNSON WORK.

"THE question of the authorship of the 'Shakespeare' Plays," writes Mr. Edward Johnson, "has been discussed *ad nauseam*, and hundreds of books have been written on the subject." After stating that the opinions of eminent men of letters are not evidence, he adds, "What we require is written evidence, which can only be found in books published at the time. Such evidence is to be found in the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays." This evidence he sets out to prove in his new book.

In this engrossing work no fewer than 23 facsimile columns of the First Folio are reproduced with the author's markings and annotations alongside. His object throughout is to demonstrate the use by Bacon of his numerical cipher leading to carefully selected combinations of letters containing his name. It will be surprising to many, for instance, how often he shows the concealed name of Bacon on the 33rd line counting up or down, 33 of course being the Simple value of the word Bacon, (2, 1, 3, 14, 13, = 33), or, again, on the 39th line which represents F. Bacon by the same method. Or, once more,

"The word BACON is found in the second column of page 53 in the Comedies in the first column of page 53 in the Histories, and in the second column of page 54 in the Histories. Suppose that the reader was looking through a book when he found the name John Jones in the middle of a page. Suppose the reader notices that the name of John Jones is on the twenty-fifth line counting up the page. This might be a coincidence, although it is not likely. Then suppose that the reader notices that there are exactly twenty letters after Jones. It is at once obvious that the name John Jones appears where it does as part of a deliberate design, because it is the exact centre of the page."

Mr. Johnson then proceeds to demonstrate by the facsimile that in the second column of page 54 in the Histories, the word BACON is found on the twenty-fifth line counting down the column, and there are twenty letters in front of BACON and also twenty letters (counting the hyphen as one) after his name.

The author's logical contention is that "if Francis Bacon was responsible for the First Folio it is clear he must have inserted something in the book to prove this and it will be found he has done so in various very ingenious ways." A strong point is made in the fact that the famous line in *The Merry Wives* (Act iv, Sc. 1), "Hang-hog is latten for Bacon, I warrant you," is the 39th line down the Simple numerical cipher for F. Bacon. A propos of this Mr. Johnson recalls that the line in question owed its origin to a witty retort by Sir Nicholas Bacon on the Bench to a prisoner who appealed for mercy as his name was Hog and so he was kindred with Bacon. "You and I cannot be kindred," returned Sir Nicholas, "except you be hanged, for Hog is not Bacon until it be well hanged." The interesting point is that this story first appeared in Bacon's *Apothegms*, first published in 1650, 34 years after Will Shaksper's death, and as Mr. Johnson observes, "no Stratfordian has ever yet explained (1) How Shaksper got hold of a private story of the Bacon family which was not printed until 34 years after his death; and (2) Why Shaksper should have specially written a scene in this play to enable this line containing BACON to be inserted." In this manner the author analyses and dissects the first introductory pages of the First Folio, including the masked Droushout portrait. Mr. Johnson's book, the fruit of great labour, sagacity, and insight, should be in the hands of every Baconian student. It is a large-sized volume to permit of the printing of the facsimile columns of the Plays. C.B.

<sup>(1)</sup> *The Mystery of the First Folio of the "Shakespeare" Plays*: by Edward D. Johnson, author of *The Fictitious Shakespeare Exposed*, etc. Published by the Bacon Society, 5s. net.

# LINKS IN THE CHAIN

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

On the 18th day of April, 1593, the printer, Richard Field, obtained a licence for the publication of a metrical version of a classical tale of love entitled "Venus and Adonis" which is written throughout in the purest, most elegant and scholarly English of that day. The author's name does not appear on the title page of this poem, but the dedication to the Earl of Southampton is signed "William Shakespeare." Will. Shaksper, of Stratford, is supposed to have arrived in London about a year previously when he must have spoken the Warwickshire dialect or patois, but there is not a trace of local patois in "Venus and Adonis." At the time of the publication of this poem Francis Bacon was thirty-two years of age and for sixteen years previously, he had had the run of Queen Elizabeth's Court, and was a personal friend of the Earl of Southampton, to whom this poem was dedicated. If Shaksper the actor was the author, how is it that there is not a scrap of evidence in existence that Southampton was acquainted with the actor or even knew of his existence?

This poem is the beginning of the first period of 1593 to 1597 when plays of passionate, romantic youthful love like "Romeo and Juliet" and plays about court life like "Love's Labour's Lost" were published.

At the age of sixteen, Francis Bacon had been sent by Queen Elizabeth to France, where he travelled over the very scenes described in the "Shakespeare" plays, visiting both Italy and Spain. According to the Cipher story on his return to England he continually pressed Queen Elizabeth to acknowledge him as her son and although she refused to do so, he always hoped that she would relent and ultimately recognise his right to the English Throne. He looked forward to the time when he would rule England and was continually thinking of the power possessed by kings. It was during this second period that the historical plays were published, all about the expectations of power which one day he hoped to possess. But Queen Elizabeth refused to do anything to recognise her son and Francis Bacon at last realised that his claim was hopeless which brings us to the third period during which we get plays like "Hamlet" and "King Lear," both plays being about rulers who have been denied power and clearly showing the author had been through similar experiences.

Eventually comes the fourth period when Francis Bacon falls from power in 1621, followed two years later by the play of "Tymon of Athens," reflecting his bitter agony. At last he comes to the conclusion that his struggles are over and that the only power left to him is that of a master of the secrets of life and death. He realises that he has now come out of the tempest of life into the quiet waters of peace so he writes "The Tempest," and gathers all his plays together and publishes them in the First Folio, at the same time printing his personal diary, "The Sonnets of Shakespeare." He had been repudiated by his world but he took care to leave behind him records to enable future generations to ascertain the truth concerning the mystery of the "Shakespeare" plays.

---

To the Editor of **BACONIANA**

Sir,

## "THE SHEPHERD'S CALENDAR."

With reference to my article on the above in "Baconiana," October, 1943, the Editor's comments on same in "Baconiana," 1944, and my reply in "Baconiana," April, 1944, the Editor objected to my describing the Earl of Leicester as a Southern Gentleman, on the grounds (*inter alia*) that his principal seat was in the Midlands, Mr. James Arther has drawn my attention to the fact that "Puttenham," in "the arte of English poesie," referring to speech used beyond the River Trent, says that it is not so courtly nor so current as our Southern English, by which it is clear that he understands by southern as contrasted with northern, the whole of south east England, below the River Trent, which includes the counties of Leicester and Warwick, with Kenilworth. The description of Leicester as a southern gentleman would, therefore, appear to be correct.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.



## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Sir,

### BACON AND SIR ANTHONY COOKE.

In the section of "The Statesmen and Favourites of Queen Elizabeth," by David Lloyd (1665) headed "Sir Anthony Cooke," there is evidence that Francis Bacon was, before going to Trinity College, Cambridge, the pupil of Sir Anthony Cooke (1504-1576).

It is said of Sir Anthony that, "he said first, and his Grandchilde, my Lord Bacon said after him, that the Joys of Parents are Secrets, and so their Grievs and Fears. Children sweeten Labours, but they embitter Misfortunes; they increase the care of Life, and mitigate the remembrance of Death. Very providently did he secure his Eternity by leaving the image of his nature in his Children, and of his mind in his Pupil."

This pupil could not refer to Edward VI as he had been dead 23 years when Sir Anthony died, and he could not, therefore, have bequeathed "the image of is mind" in him, for Edward was only 16 when he died after a long illness due to some mysterious complaint.

Certainly, if, as now appears, Sir Anthony were Bacon's tutor, he had a worthy heir.

We are further told that "the Books he advised were not many, but choice: the Business he pressed was not reading, but digesting. Sir John Cheeke talked merrily; Dr. Coxe solidly, and Sir Anthony Cooke weighingly: A faculty that was derived with his blood to his Grandchilde, Bacon."

Sir Anthony Cooke's grandson was named Anthony after him. He was born 1559 and died 1604. Drayton, in 1594, dedicated his "Idea's Mirror" "To the deare chyld of the Muses, and his ever kind Mecaenas, Mr. Anthony Cooke, Esquire."

Drayton begins his Dedication:

Vouchsafe to grace these rude unpolish'd lines  
Which long, dear friend, have slept in sable night.

It would be interesting if more information could be obtained about Drayton's patron and friend, for it is provocative to find this relationship between Drayton and Bacon's cousin.

It is no less curious to observe in the anonymous tragedy 'Arden of Fever-shame' (1592):

Of late Lord Cheiny lost some plate,  
Which one did bring, and sould it at my shoppe,  
Saying he served Sir Anthony Cooke.

II, 1.

The unknown dramatist (some have attributed the play to Shakespeare) took his material from Holinshed's Chronicle.

Holinshed does not name Sir Anthony Cooke, but Sir Anthony Ager. I can discover nothing about Sir Anthony Ager.

The actual murder took place on February 15th, 1550-1, and created tremendous interest. Ballads were written about it.

Why did the dramatist alter this name? I rather suspect that Drayton wrote the play which is not quite good enough for "Shakespeare."

31, Arundel Road,  
Cheam.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE.



To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Sir,

"HAMLET" AND FRANCIS BACON.

Col. R. G. Turner in his letter in the October "Baconiana" gives the following quotation from "Hamlet":—

"The first row of the pious chanson will show you more."

The word in the First Folio is PONS not PIOUS. The tenth and eleventh lines down the second column of the page numbered 263 in the Tragedies are:—

PONS chanson will shew you more. For looke where my  
ABRIDGEMENTS come.

What evidently happened was this: Francis Bacon, when going through the text of the play *Hamlet* in the Quarto Edition before transferring it to the First Folio came across the word "abridgement" in the middle of the line. He wondered if he could make anything of this word and noticed that the first seven letters of the word spell ABRIDGE. Good—what is the Latin for a Bridge—"PONS"—so he altered the text to make "abridgement" the first word on a line and then changed the word "PIOUS" in the Quarto to "PONS" and made this word PONS the first word on the line above the line the first letters of which are ABRIDGE as shown above. He evidently hoped that some intelligent reader would notice this and ask himself the question "What does this mean?" because it is obvious (even to a Stratfordian) that the Latin word for "A BRIDGE" and the English words "a Bridge" do not appear where they are found by accident. Francis Bacon therefore hoped that this discovery, if made, would put the reader upon enquiry and induce him to look up and down the margins of the pages in the First Folio and thus find some of the 550 Acrostic Words which he had written in the margins, 172 examples of which are shown in my book, "Shakespearian Acrostics."

Birmingham.

Yours faithfully,  
EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Sir,

"THE MEANEST OF MANKIND."

I notice that I am described in the October number of BACONIANA at p. 178 as "the late Mr. Kendra Baker"! This merits a corrigendum.

Though "late" in the sense of being no longer a fairly frequent contributor to BACONIANA I am, in fact, not yet quite as "late" as your description of me might lead some of my old friends among your readers to suppose.

Indeed my interest in the Baconian Cause is as keen as ever, though, of necessity, less active.

Your contributor, Mr. James Arther, in his article "A Bacon Concordance is possible" offers "a few words of warning regarding the use of concordances." Apropos of this, may I venture—without immodesty—to quote from the Review of my Pamphlet, "Pope and Bacon, the meaning of 'Meanest' in the *Morning Post* by the late Mr. Ian Colvin, its leader writer and literary critic, which appeared in that paper on the 16th July, 1937.

He says:—When Alexander Pope wrote of Francis Bacon "wisest, brightest meanest of mankind" did he intend to convey a sneer? So it is generally thought; but Mr. Kendra Baker demonstrates in this admirable piece of Scholarship that there was no such intention. Pope admired and revered Bacon, as he revered and admired Dryden, of whom he wrote:

Ill fated Dryden! who unmoved can see  
Th' extremes of wit and meanness joined in thee?

And he used the word "mean" in the one case and in the other, as it was commonly used in his time, in no derogatory sense, but as meaning "poor" or "unfortunate," just as to this day the Americans speak of 'mean whites' when they intend 'poor whites.' The gradual degradation of the word has thus led to a complete misunderstanding of the poet's meaning, and as epigram is more injurious than truth, the line has coloured the common view of Bacon's character.

Now, Sir, it seems strange, to say the least of it, that this very materia passage concerning Dryden (whom the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* describes as Pope's "hero and master") is apparently omitted from Abbott's Concordance of Pope. I say "apparently" for I have never seen the Work and was in fact unaware of its existence, which seems a fortunate circumstance, for me, as I might have been most seriously misled, had I known of and relied upon it.

The fact is, much more is needed for the elucidation of this or any other problem than is to be found in an abbreviated concordance and superficial conclusions derived from a few words. If Mr. Arther will do me the favour of perusing my Pamphlet, I cannot but feel that he may find occasion to vary his view (1) that the poet meant to brand Bacon as the "shamefullest, most debased, disgraced, dishonoured" man of his time, or (2) that Pope was no better than his own description of the Libeller in his Prologue to the Satires:—

"This painted child of dirt, that stinks and stings."

"Heatherbank," Hindhead.

Yours faithfully,

H. KENDRA BAKER.

(We apologise to Mr. Kendra Baker for the error which described him as "late," through an oversight. He might, like Mark Twain, describe it, as "a slight exaggeration!" Mr. Kendra Baker is very much alive as his letter exemplifies.—EDITOR).

To the Editor of *BACONIANA*

Sir,

#### BACON'S *DE AUGMENTIS* TITLE PAGE OF 1645

In Mr. Walter Ellis' recently published booklet, "The Shakespeare Myth" there is a reproduction of the well-known title-page to book IX of the Latin Edition of *De Augmentis*, 1645.

Those who have attempted to read the meaning of the Emblem have usually given attention to the mountain, the temple, and the strange figure, which is holding a closed book. I wish to draw attention to the volume on the table. The right hand of Bacon points to the open page and the book hides the right foot of the "actor." The right foot of Bacon is visible, his right hand is in strong light and his left hand in heavy shadow. I would remind students of the saying of William Blake with regard to his symbolic drawings, "Observe carefully the hands and the feet."

But my immediate purpose is to consider the open page of the Folio. It appears to be about the middle of the book: on the left hand page are dots to indicate the title of a Play, with lines to indicate printing. The dots number eighteen. Now, among the Plays in the Folio there is one, a little before the middle of the volume, which has eighteen words in the title, on the left hand page. This is page 70 of *The Histories*, *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth* Containing his death and the Coronation of King Henry the Fifth. On the bottom of the right hand page, to which Bacon's finger points, are the lines:—

And let the world no longer be a stage

To feed Contention in a ling'ring Act

But let one spirit of the First-borne *Caine*

followed by the catch-word, *Reigne*, and the printer's pagemark, g.

We notice first the Capital letters, B (But), A (Act), and Con. First-borne catches the eye, as do the letters F, b, C. Here is an anagram. From the words "First-borne *Caine*" remove the letters of "Reigne" (from which the "g" has been, as it were, taken by the printer) which belongs properly to the next page (to reign was laid aside by, or for, Francis Bacon). We now have the letters F.I.R.S.T.B.O.N.C.A. which can be arranged as Sir F. Bacon, T. The T may indicate Tudor, of which House he was the First-born. The passage may thus be read—

And let the world no longer be a stage

To feed Contention in a ling'ring Act

But let one spirit of—Sir F. Bacon, T.

Reign in all bosomes . . .

It is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Yours truly,

London.

12th Sept., 1946.

MABEL SENNETT.